

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XIII

OCTOBER, 1928

No. 4

EDITORIAL

THE VERY LIVES OF SOME MEN ARE MIGHTY ARGUMENTS for the miraculous. Deprived of most of the conventional forms of preparation for a successful career, they ignore any such lack and move steadily forward toward high achievement as though conscious from the first of a great destiny. They appear unhampered by doubt, hesitation or discouragement, and the greater the difficulty encountered, the more brilliantly are their powers displayed.

John Bunyan was such a man. He cannot be explained as the product of exceptional hereditary influences, favorable environment or rare educational advantages. His marvelously influential life was the result of a spiritual revolution issuing in "a new creation," and of the resultant overwhelming motive to devote himself wholly to the service of his Saviour and Lord.

The Christian world this year celebrates the tercentenary of this "prince of dreamers," who was born in November, 1628. The interest in this event has been remarkable, and new and special editions of *Pilgrim's Progress* mark a revival of interest in this immortal work.

But Bunyan, with some sixty books to his credit,

was more than a writer only. For some sixteen years he was pastor of the Nonconformist congregation at Bedford, now called the Bunyan Meeting. Under the heading, John Bunyan, Pastor and Preacher, Mr. Cockett, the present pastor in the line of Bunyan's successors, has made a fine contribution to our understanding of a side of Bunyan's work not often enlarged upon.

After references to his early years this account turns to Bunyan's place in the Bedford congregation and to his other ministerial labors. The quotations from the old records of the church are valuable, revealing the high spirituality and the rigorous standards of conduct maintained. We understand that the record, by years, of members during Bunyan's pastorate has not been published before, having been discovered but recently.

Mr. Cockett's article brings us nearer than ever to this marvelous preacher of Christ, and it should inspire pastors to aid in reviving the interest in Bunyan's great book.

SOME THEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS HAVE CONTINUALLY allured the keenest minds ever since our Lord's advent, yet it cannot be said that they have been settled to the full satisfaction of theologians in general. The questions themselves are baffling in their depth and mystery; intellects are limited; prejudices are stubborn; full comprehension and unanimous agreement are hard to reach.

Yet, whatever the difficulties, men cannot rest in the presence of an unsolved mystery. However hazy their attempted solutions, they must offer them. But now and then more light is thrown on the matter, little by little progress is made, and so we gain a deeper knowledge of the life, the work, and the message of Him who came that we might have life more abundantly.

The problem of the kenosis is a case in point. One may experience inexpressible peace in his Saviour and Lord, and yet have an unsatisfied longing to understand fully the relation between the divine and human in Christ, as involved in the kenosis; it may remain to him a mystery. Naturally a great literature has developed on this subject. It is therefore with considerable satisfaction that we present Professor McClain's paper, *The Doctrine of the Kenosis in Philippians 2:5-8*. Its acumen and force have moved a competent theologian to pronounce this discussion unsurpassed by anything extant upon the subject.

After noticing briefly the early shifting of emphasis as between our Lord's Deity and His humanity, and the later development of various kenotic theories, the paper takes up the theme proper. Professor McClain's reasoning is so sound and his style so lucid that no analysis here could add to his able treatment. Readers who have found the general arguments about the kenosis inconclusive, if not confusing, may well feel indebted to the writer of this able piece of doctrinal exposition.

SO IMPORTANT ARE THE CONTRIBUTIONS BEING MADE BY archeology to our understanding of many things in the Scriptures that it becomes necessary to be informed on the subject if one is to be a thorough student of Biblical history. This is peculiarly true respecting certain Old Testament records and problems. Much light has been thrown on them thus far, but a realization of the amount of work still awaiting the spade invites the hope that we may have yet greater revelations.

One of the notable figures among the men of the Pentateuch is Jacob, but have we even yet given him his true place in the history of Israel? Perhaps less nota-

ble, among places, is Shechem, associated with the life of Jacob, but how many Bible students realize how great a place was held by Shechem in the early religious development of the chosen people? Bishop Du Bose, in *Shechem and the Historicity of Jacob*, not only adds to our information on these matters, but quickens our interest in these pages of ancient history to the point of making them fascinating. Jacob has seemed rather a man who forced his way into the line of patriarchs by a shrewd and selfish trick than as one who possessed a deeply spiritual nature, but this latter side of his character is well brought out in this article. In fact, one can hardly read it and not view in a new light Jacob and his times.

What is given here, concerning Shechem and the account of the discoveries thus far made there by Bishop Du Bose and Dr. Sellin of Berlin, provokes our impatience over the delay in excavating the promising ruins of the necropolis of that ancient center. Why does not someone supply the means, not to gratify mere curiosity, but to satisfy the honest desire for knowledge and for the settlement of questions raised by an overconfident and premature criticism?

INCREASING EVIDENCE FAVORS BELIEF IN "PRIMEVAL monotheism," to borrow a term used by Bishop Du Bose. That is to say, we are not to regard polytheism as the forerunner of monotheism, but rather that it was a result of the degeneration of the latter.

A reading of the Bishop's paper on the subject, which was published in April, 1927, has moved Dr. Martin, a retired professor of Semitic literature, to send us under the caption, *The Harper's Lament*, an interesting testimony to the soundness of this thesis.

This lament, prayer or meditation, as the reader prefers, is indeed a reminder of the Old Testament, as this translator says. Some students may differ with Professor Martin, concerning the proper rendering of "I am that I am" (Ex. 3:14), and over the question of the meaning of day in Genesis 1, but he has given us a glimpse, through a beautiful literary window, of the idea of God and of the view of death held in Egypt a millennium and a half before Christ.

THE LATE DR. CAMDEN M. COBERN, THE ARCHEOLOGIST, had an excellent paper in these pages in January, 1918, under the title, *Archeological Discoveries and the Old Testament*. In referring to recent finds in Egypt he remarked:

"During the period from Isaiah to Ezra perhaps the most startling discovery has been that of the colonies of strangers from Persia and India found settled in Memphis, and the large and important colony of Hebrews near Elephantine (*cf.* Isa. 19:19)."

Dr. Cobern could do little more in a single article than touch upon the significance of the historic facts thus brought to light; but Dr. Flournoy, a close student of the bearing of such recent discoveries upon the Bible, contributes to the present issue a more detailed paper upon *The Long Hidden Treasures of Elephantiné*.

After a description of this island, which has a history not devoid of importance, we come to the consideration of the papyri found there in 1904 and 1907. The accounts of several archeologists are freely drawn upon by Dr. Flournoy, and, most interesting of all, there are quotations from these very papyri found at Elephantiné.

We learn that the Jews on this island in the Nile

were far from an insignificant group, and that other important races were represented there as well. But our interest centers in the revelations as to Jewish life and customs, in the light thrown upon the date of Ezra and Nehemiah, which some modern critics have placed too late, in the evidence that the Jewish ritual of worship long antedated Ezra, and in the fact that Biblical names supposed to be those of mythological characters represent actual persons.

The whole paper illustrates the unwisdom of denying, on the ground of critical scholarship only, the accuracy of Scriptural history, before archeology has completed its mighty task. There is always the chance that even the historic characters concerned may yet "whisper out of the dust."

THE CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER INCLUDE EXTENDED reviews of five important volumes covering as many fields. The writers of these reviews have plainly devoted considerable painstaking study to the books under consideration, all of which is to the reader's advantage.

The titles are:

Christianity, Past and Present.—*Guignebert.*

The Wrestle of Religion with Truth.—*Wieman.*

The Second Isaiah.—*Torrey.*

The Making of Luke-Acts.—*Cadbury.*

Divorce and the Roman Doctrine of Nullity.—*Charles.*

R. M. K.

JOHN BUNYAN, PASTOR AND PREACHER

By REV. C. BERNARD COCKETT, M.A., Minister, Bunyan Meeting House,
Bedford, England

JOHN BUNYAN the man is as great as his works; the story of his labors is a romance and his life is a triumph. Grace reigned!

Thomas Bunyan, a brazier, married Margaret Bentley and led his bride to an old cottage, with a forge, in the fields at Harrowden on the edge of the Elstow Parish. Harrowden, like Harrow-on-the-Hill, was once the scene of idol worship, and about the beginning of November, 1628, near the running brook between the hedgerows, Thomas welcomed their firstborn, the babe who was to create "Christian." Across the lovely green fields they took the child to the Elstow Abbey Church for his christening at the stone font on November 30, 1628. "His name is John."

The young tinker left school early and followed his father's calling. At the age of sixteen he stood twice in one month by the side of the grave in the Elstow churchyard, for his mother and his sister had passed away. With indecent haste his father married again, and the lad was probably glad to enter the Parliamentary army during the Civil War. He was stationed at Newport Pagnell from 1644 to 1647, and he was greatly impressed because a companion who had taken his duty as sentinel at the siege of Leicester was shot—"He loved me and gave himself for me." England was in the throes of her struggle for political and religious liberty, and this "child of the Petition of Right" was to use his

experience as a soldier and his knowledge as a Bedford townsman to portray the Holy War, the fight for Mansoul.

Being discharged, he returned to Elstow, and soon we find him with his simple but splendid village bride in the little cottage by the wayside. Two good dowry books, *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*, and *The Practice of Piety*, read to him around the winter fire, the birth of his blind Mary in 1650 and then Elizabeth—both christened at their father's font, the sermon of Christopher Hall against Sabbath-breaking, the voice from Heaven near the Market Cross on the village green while playing tip-cat, the rebuke from a woman of bad reputation because of his swearing, were all mile-stones in his spiritual pilgrimage. Bell-ringing and dancing he renounced, and the talk in the sun of the three poor women of Bedford about the new birth and its peace and joy in their souls, to which he listened in wonder, eventually brought him to the knowledge of John Gifford, rector of St. John's Church, founder of Bunyan Meeting (1650). In the old rectory and its lovely gardens the ex-Royalist Major talked of things divine to the ex-Roundhead private, until "holy Mr. Gifford," his "Evangelist," led him to the wicket gate. This young cavalier of Christ was immersed in the Duck Mill natural baptistry of the River Ouse and joined the church in 1653. He took his first communion from the 1576 chalice, and his name stands twenty-seventh on our present church roll.

Gifford held that "faith in Christ and holiness of life" were the basis of membership in the church of Christ, baptism being "circumstantiall" and not an essential. This was Bunyan's view and has remained the practice of our church. In our old Minute Book,

now being published for this Tercentenary Year, there is the charming record, May 25, 1660, that "Our brother Bunyan be prepared to speak a word to us at the next Church Meeting." The young lay preacher discovered this his word had power—"every word burneth"—and after hesitation—"At first it did much dash and abash my spirit"—and secret prickings, the inward urge drove him into his calling, by the grace of God, preacher of the Gospel of His dear Son. An old etching shows the young preacher in 1659 conducting an open-air service in front of Bedford's Moot Hall near the river bridge. Controversies with the Quakers, whom he misunderstood, and Ranters, led to the publication of his first book, where he disputes for a Calvinist theology and the faith once delivered to the saints.

On November 12, 1660, he visited Samsell for a service in a farmhouse. He was warned that Francis Wingate had issued a warrant of arrest, but Bunyan's determination to stand and not to fly led him to become a martyr for religious liberty. This tinker-preacher was taken to Harlington Manor, but Dr. Lindale, Mr. Foster, Mr. Wingate, Sir John Kelynge, Judge Twisden, and Sir Matthew Hale could not shake the prisoner's decision to proclaim the Gospel. The fight for "freedom to prophesy" sent Bunyan to the county gaol for twelve long years. The restoration of Charles II was the cause of Bunyan's imprisonment, and the Declaration of Indulgence set him free. In prison Bunyan acted as an unofficial gaol chaplain and wrote a number of prison books. In *Prison Meditations* he attempts poetry, and asks, "When all men's cards are fully played, whose will abide the light?" and foretells his own vindication. *Grace Abounding*, one of the world's noblest spiritual biographies, is a "prison epistle," for

John Bunyan, like Paul, silenced as a speaker, became a writer, and the written word remains.

John Gifford was succeeded by John Burton, after the personal decision of Oliver Cromwell in a church dispute, but at the Restoration our people became homeless, meeting for worship in shops and cottages and barns; they were persecuted in dissenter hunts, but most of them remained steadfast. In 1672 John Bunyan was called by the brethren of Bedford, Gamlingay, and Hanes to be their pastor, and in his application for license to preach twenty-five other men and thirty centers of worship are mentioned. The barn of Josias Ruffhead, situated in an orchard in Mill Lane, was bought for fifty pounds, and the indenture is on the walls of our small but fascinating museum, near Bunyan's vestry chair.

"Bishop" Bunyan itinerated throughout the Midland Provinces as the accepted leader of nonconformity, oft in journeyings and in labors many. Like Paul he worked at his trade and followed his calling in a true apostolic succession. The Pilgrim Fathers, harried out of this land to become the corner-stone of a great people, thought they might follow fishing, the apostles' own calling, on the wild New England shore. Some of the small towns of Lincolnshire helped to man the Mayflower, and Bunyan was a village lad who became famous, a tradesman who developed into a genius. The villages of England are the springs of our national life. After a storm of struggle in his soul, he found his personality reconstructed about Christ on a higher level of consciousness—"His grace is sufficient," "He is able"—and discovered that the inflow of the grace of God, the descent of the superconsciousness was a "creative inaugural experience." The glory of the Gospel is that it

makes somebodies out of nobodies, and John Bunyan is one of history's noblest examples of the redemptive process that releases divine power in the soul of an ordinary man. He lived in a little house in St. Cuthbert's, with his brave second wife, Elizabeth, and his beloved blind Mary, who had sold tagged laces with her father outside the county gaol. He faced the world anew in 1672 with his fortunes shattered, but his faith secure.

Our Church Minute Book, filled with pages of Bunyan's handwriting, reveals him as the tireless shepherd of souls visiting church members in spiritual difficulty, exercising the spiritual discipline necessary for refractory people, touring the countryside for the inducting of ministers, and counselling the faithful. Bunyan was the natural moderator of nonconformity in the Midland counties, and I have traced his footsteps over a very large area.

After his release from prison he visited Leicester, showed his license to the mayor in the old Guild Hall, and slept in an old house which stood nearly opposite the Church of St. Nicholas. At Cranfield the memory of his ecstatic sermon on The Holy City still lingers in the name of Paradise Pond, and at Harlington he held open air services round a sturdy oak, a wonderful pulpit, still called Bunyan's Oak. I preached from it on June 21, at the Harlington commemoration. At Hitchin, Bunyan's friend, John Wilson, became minister, and Bunyan used to hold secret midnight meetings in the Wainwood Dell, the Foster brothers acting as sentries. Preston, Bendish, Breachwood Green, and Tinker's Hall hold traditions of the tinker-evangelist, and at Mob's Hole Meadow he was pelted by the crowd. At Spoon Dell, Dunstable, Thorne, Edworth, Gamlingay,

Hanes, and Coleman's Green stories still linger, and the parish churches at Yelden and Eaton Socon welcomed as a preacher this passionate and powerful apostle of Christ who loved his Master so greatly—"I felt a love for Christ as hot as fire."

He yearned for converting work; he travailed to bring forth children unto God; he preached often as if an angel stood at his side, and many souls ever after had reason to thank God for His inspired tinker who not only mended pots and pans but broken lives as well. Bunyan helped to set free the soul of the middle and lower classes of England (to use the common terms so detested by democrats who believe in the brotherhood of Britain) from the tyranny of an aristocratic and monarchical church, an instrument of Stuart despotism. "Man shall not be governed in his approaches to God" either by church or state, and what Bunyan learned in Martin Luther's Commentary on the Galatians, he carried over into English Puritanism, and he is its essence and epitome. Such sturdy souls make a great people, and Cromwell's Ironsides and Bunyan's Greatheart rank with Drake, Nelson, and Wellington, though Puritanism is seen better in its writers than in its soldiers, and universal peace for freedom to establish the Kingdom of God in man's soul is our aim today.

A tinker prate! A carpenter prophesy! Dr. John Owen told Charles II, "I would gladly give up all my learning if I could preach like that tinker," for Bunyan became a popular preacher in London after Pilgrim's Progress made him celebrated.

In 1675, when persecution broke out afresh, Bunyan, now the minister of our meeting house was lodged for six months in the town gaol on the old bridge at Bedford, across the charming River Ouse. This was his

den and here he dreamed his dream of the Pilgrim, described by Macaulay as "the highest miracle of genius." The pastor in prison gave to the world its immortal allegory, a guidebook for all pilgrims who abhor the City of Destruction and seek the Celestial City. When Bunyan was released from this prison he returned to his little home in St. Cuthbert's, where he probably finished the story, published in 1678, and wrote the second part, and also *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman* and *The Holy War*. *Pilgrim's Progress* is the first best seller in English literature, 100,000 copies being sold in his own lifetime. It brought Bunyan into prominence, and he visited London to lecture at Pinner's Hall and preach in different churches. Zoar Street Chapel, Southwark, was one of them, and though the church has vanished, we treasure the pulpit.

Bunyan as a pastor presents a fascinating picture, and the following excerpts from our Church Minute Book reveal the minister of a small congregation in a barn in a historic town of from fifteen hundred to two thousand souls.

The church records commence with May 24, 1656, and his name first appears on June 28, 1657, when it was agreed he should pay a visit with Brother Child.

Bunyan was nominated as a deacon on September 27, but not elected—"Bro. Bunyan being taken off by preaching of the Gospel."

In 1658 he neglected to visit Brother Skelton and Sister Chamberlain and was "required to take care of it against the next Meeting."

On October 30, 1658, Brother Burton (pastor) and Brothers Grew, Harrington, Whiteman, and Bunyan had "to consider of some things that may conduce to love and unity amongst us all."

In 1660 "the will of God . . . crossed the law of England," and John Bunyan, the prophet, became the prisoner, with certain liberties during the earlier period, for on September 28, 1661, it was agreed that he should visit and admonish "certain of our friends" who have "withdrawn themselves."

His name is mentioned on October 26, and then disappears for several years, while the Church Book after March, 1663, is silent for four and a half years—and the silence is more eloquent than many minutes.

Grace Abounding was printed in 1666, and he writes like an apostle to the saints at Bedford: "Children, Grace be with you, Amen. . . . my soul hath fatherly care and desire after your spiritual and everlasting welfare."

The "Acts" of the church begin again in 1668, and Bunyan takes a leading part in affairs. Long persecution had broken certain spirits, and Bunyan with other brothers was called upon to admonish the unfaithful. The stories of divesting unworthy deacons of their office, solemnly casting out erring members, winning back to the fold "a fair and flourishing Professor," Brother Whitbread, conversations with troublesome Sister Landy, an epistle to the neighboring churches respecting charges laid against Robert Nelson and Richard Deane—"now cut off and cast out," signed by Samuel Fenn, John Bunyan, John Whiteman, and John Fenn, are proofs that church discipline was then a reality.

On November 24, 1671, "the Church was also minded to seek God about the choice of Bro. Bunyan to the office of an elder, that their way in that respect may be cleared up to them." This action was confirmed on

December 31, and on January 21, 1672, a general meeting was called to ratify the appointment.

After much seeking God by prayer, and sober conference formerly had, the Congregation did at this meeting with joynt consent (signified by solemne lifting up of their hands) call forth and appoint our brother John Bunyan to the pastorall office or eldership. And he accepting thereof, gave up himself to serve Christ and his Church in that charge; and received of the Elders the right hand of fellowship.

The same time also, the Congregation having had long experience of the faithfulness of brother John ffenne in his care for the poor, did after the same manner solemnely choose him to the honourable office of a deacon and committed their poor and purse to him, and he accepted thereof, and gave up himself to ye Lord and them in that service.

The Congregation did also determine to keep the 26th of this instant, as a day of fasting and prayer both here, and at Hanes, and at Gamlinghay solemnely to recommend to the grace of God brother Bunyan, brother ffenne and the rest of the brethren, and to intreat his gracious assistance and presence with them in their respective worke whereunto he hath called them.

Bunyan was released from prison in 1672 and remained minister until his death in 1688. The Church Book contains entries in Bunyan's handwriting, revealing his pastoral difficulties—"day of humiliation and prayer," Brother Witt's wife cast out for railing and other wicked practices, members of the congregation have run into debt, one sister is rebuked for immodesty, Sister Elizabeth Maxey had been admonished for disobedience to her parents, to wit, for calling her father a liar, and on May 10, 1674, at the church meeting in Bedford it was reported that "our Sister Landy had been admonished for withdrawing communion again, for countenancing Card-play, and for deceiving the Church with her former seeming repentance."

In 1674 Bunyan was innocently involved in a scandal with Agnes Beaumont, over the sudden death of her

father, but minister and fair church member were both completely vindicated.

Bunyan even met Mr. Badman in his own church, when John Rush was cast out "for being drunk after a very beastly and filthy manner," and John Wileman's "frothy letter" is answered by Bunyan and entered in our Church Book in these terms:

ffriend Wileman,

Your letter has bin plainly read before us, and since you have bin withdrawn ffrom by the church ffor lying, railing, and scandalizing of the church in generall, and som of the brethren in perticuler: It is expected

1. That there be the signes of true repentance found in you for the same

2. And also that you bring from the hands of those in the countrey before whom you have abused us som signe of their satisfaction concerning your repentance before we can admitt you againe into our communion.

Written for you and sent you by order of the congregation.

Letters to certain members are preserved in our records, and the task of strengthening the persecuted and cheering the depressed was often given to John Bunyan. In the letter "To our beloved Sister Kathyrine Hustwhat" the following paragraphs are of interest:

Therefore, our beloved Sister, stirre up the grace of God that is in thee, and lay hold by faith on eternall life; and count when thou art tempted much, yet the end of that temptation will come, the end and then effect. And remember that even our dearest Lord could not breake off the tempter in ye middle. But when Sathan had ended *all* the temptation, then he departed from him for a season.

That Gospell which thou hast received is no cunnningly devised fable, but the very truth and verity of God. Wherefore be not shaken in minde, or troubled with unbelief or Atheisme. Looke to the promise, looke to Jesus, looke to his blood, and what work it hath with the justice of God for sinners.

Lastly, sister, ffarewell. Watch and be sober; have patience to the Coming of the Lord. And in the meane while

looke to thy lamp. The Lord poure of his golden oyle into it, and also into the vessell of thy soule. Keepe thy worke before thee, and be renewed in the spirit of thy minde. Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

Written by the appointment of this congregation, and subscribed by their consent by your dear brethren, who pray for you and intreat prayers for this despised handfull of the Lord's heritage.

JOHN WHITEMAN
JOHN BUNYAN
WILL. MAN, &C.

The letter written to John Wilson, first minister of the Tilehouse Street Baptist Church, Hitchin, is apostolic.

To our dear brother Joh. Wilson: We are comforted in thee, our dearely beloved, when we remember that from a childe thou hast knowne the Holy Scriptures, that in thy tender yeares thy faith was fruitfull, to the great comfort of us thy brethren. It is also joy to us to behold, that notwithstanding thy lot is cast in a place of high transgression, yet thou shonest out of a good conversation thy works with meekness of wisdom. God help thee, brother, to remember the dayes of thy youth; the first wayes of David were best. There are but few can say as Caleb: As my strength was forty yeares since so it is now, both to go out and come in before the people of God. 'Tis also saide of Moses, to ye day of his death his naturall force was not abated, neither did his eye waxe dimme.

Brother, be alwayes looking into the perfect Lawe of liberty and *continue* therein. The customes of the people are vaine; learne therefore of no man any of the deeds of darkenes. We must give an account of ourselves to God. It argueth not onely wisdom but great grace when the soul makes all lye leuell to the word and Spirit of God; when he scorneth and counteth that unworthy of his affections that hath not on it a stamp of the things of heaven. It is saide of the children, especially the Elders of Israell, They saw God and did eat and drinke; that's the right eating and drinking indeed.

Honoured brother, God hath not onely counted you worthy to believe in his Son, but also to professe him before ye world; weare his name in your forehead. They that Christ

will owne for his Servants for ever, must say *plainely*, I love my Master; they must declare *plainely* they seek a country.

'Tis saide of Hananiah he feared God above many. God continue our joy of thee, brother, our hope of thee is stedfast through grace. It is a strange sight to behold those who did feed delicately to be desolate in the street, and they that were brought up in scarlet to imbrace dunghills. We speake not these things to shame thee, but as our beloved brother we warne thee. O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust; watch and be sober. And if thou incline to sleep, let that of Delilah rouse thee: the Philistines be upon thee, Sampson.

Grace be with thee. The Lord is at hand. Behold, the judge stands at the doore; Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus.

Written by the appointment and subscribed in ye name and with the Consent of the Congregation, by

Your brethren in the faith and patience of Christ, who also begge your prayers for this despised Congregation.

Sam. Ffenn.

Joh. Whiteman.

Joh. Bunyan.

Joh. Ffenn.

Joh. Croker.

Will. Man, &c.

Bunyan entered the names "of persons deceased in the congregation from November 1681"—Samuel Fenn, the elder being on the list—and other names were added to those who had passed away between August 30, 1682, and March 31, 1683.

The number of members added during the years of Bunyan's ministry in our church is an interesting example of the pastor developing into the famous preacher and author, extensive labors for England succeeding his intensive work in Bedford:

1672—30	1676—15	1681— 6	1687— 4
1673—12	1677—16	1682— 4	1688—11
1674—17	1678— 8	1683— 1	——
1675—31	1679— 1	1684— 4	Total 160

Those who long for some great thing to do should not despise the day of small things, for the mightiest river begins with a spring and a stream in a quiet place.

Blessed be our Bethlehems and Nazareths and our Bedfords.

In 1685 Bunyan made his will, evidently fearing persecution, and this document, with his cabinet and jug and walking stick, fascinates pilgrims from all parts of the world. His last act was a mission of mercy, for listening to the plea of a neighbor in Bedford, he journeyed to Reading to reconcile this neighbor and his enraged father. The ministry of reconciliation was successful, and Bunyan set out for London. Overtaken by a storm, a drenched pilgrim arrived at the Sign of the Star, John Strudwick's grocer's shop at Snow Hill, Holborn.

Bunyan preached his last sermon August 19, at Mr. Gamman's meeting near Whitechapel, after which he was stricken with sickness. He saw The Acceptable Sacrifice through the press from his deathbed, and on August 31 this Christian passed through the River of Death to receive his welcome to the Celestial City. His garment of mortality was laid to rest in Strudwick's vault in the Bunhill Fields Cemetery, City Road, London, opposite Wesley's Chapel, behind which John Wesley's body was interred. Our people were heart-broken, as we know from the Church Book:

Wednesday 4th of September was kept in prayre and humilyation for this Heavy Stroak upon us, ye Death of deare Brother Bunyan. Apoynted also that Wednesday next be kept in praire and humiliation on the same Account.

Apoynted that all ye Brethren meet together on the 18th of this month Sept., to Humble themselves for this Heavy hand of God upon us.

Tuesday ye 18th was the whole congregation mett to Humble themselves before God by ffasting and prayre for this Hevy and Sevear Stroak upon us in takeing away our Honoured Brother Bunyan by death.

"Dear Brother Bunyan" had died far away from

his beloved Bedford home, as his memorial sundial in the Garden of Remembrance testifies, and the little house in St. Cuthbert's was filled with sorrow.

In 1692 his successor, Ebenezer Chandler, published Bunyan's collected works. In 1707 "The Old Meeting" took the place of the barn, to be followed in 1849 by the present sanctuary, the Bunyan Meeting House.

The statue of the preacher, with a Bible in his hand, facing toward the site of the county gaol, where the Bible and Foxe's Book of Martyrs were his chief companions, is on the corner of St. Peter's Green at Bedford. Twelve years' study of the Bible in prison gave Bunyan a most intimate knowledge of Holy Writ, and on Whitsunday our church procession halted, while words of commemoration were read from the place the prison once occupied. The style and the spirit of the Scriptures stole into his writings, and his Pilgrim, written in the town prison, has entered palaces. Hastings, Duke of Bedford, gave the statue to the town in 1874 because his mother read Pilgrim's Progress to him when he was a boy, and the Duke presented to our church in 1876 beautiful bronze doors, with pilgrim panels, unique in Great Britain. Visitors shake Christian by the hand and then pause to look upon the county gaol door in the church vestibule. Westminster Abbey has a Bunyan window, Southwark Cathedral and the Baptist Church House in London possess Bunyan memorials, and North America is coming into a similar heritage. Bunyan never left England, but his words have gone out to the ends of the earth.

During this tercentenary year, John Bunyan's greatness is emerging into a clearer light. Like Lincoln, he struggled from obscurity to eminence as the result of splendid service nobly rendered. The tinker

became a martyr for religious liberty and a master of the English tongue, writing sixty books, one of them being already translated into 120 languages, and forming, with the Bible, in the mission fields the basis of new life and literature for old civilizations renewing their youth and young cultures whose glory is yet to be. His name liveth forevermore, and he has been hailed as England's greatest religious genius.

The brazier, through the grace of God becomes a member of Christ, a pastor, a minister of a meeting house, a "Bishop" and a "Dear Brother" to all his people. He refused to wear any denominational label; he repudiated the shibboleths of sectarianism—"I am a Christian," and as that was the only title he recognized he belongs to us all. He was an apostle of church unity, far ahead of the divided denominationalism of the twentieth century in his vision of the united apostolic church that will bring in the City of God. "Faith in Christ and holiness of life" was the center of his soul and ministry, and it is still the basis of the Bunyan Meeting House, a united Congregational and Baptist church, welcoming Presbyterians and other Protestants, the working model of a united free church.

John Bunyan became a member of a Puritan congregation worshipping in the parish church during the commonwealth régime; he joined the church of St. John the Baptist, and John prepared the way for Jesus. That was John's work—John Baptist; that is John's work—John Bunyan, for grace reigns in Christ, and the church is His to establish on earth the Kingdom of Heaven.

If John's vision of a united church becomes ours, then the trumpets will sound on the other side, and the bells will chime on this side, to the greater glory of God.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE KENOSIS IN PHILIPPIANS 2:5-8

By ALVA J. MCCLAIN, Secretary of the Foreign Missionary Society of the
Brethren Church

THIS passage in the Philippian Epistle has been so closely connected with certain problems of Christology that any discussion of it will be the more complete if prefaced by a brief historical survey in this particular field of Christian doctrine. Such a survey will serve to show the theological importance of the passage, why the attention of Christologists from the first was drawn to it inevitably, and how speculations regarding the Person of Christ have finally culminated in several theories, related in principle, which receive their name from a Greek word in the passage, and are based to a greater or less extent upon it.

The dreariest, most barren pages of church history deal with that period of Christological controversy which followed the Nicene Council. Having successfully repelled the Arian assault, the attention of the church had logically shifted to another problem—how to reconcile proper Deity and true humanity in the Person of the historic Saviour, Jesus Christ. Over this question discussion ran the gamut of conceivable opinion. Men, according to their bias, became Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monophysites, Monothelites, Adoptionists, and Niobites, until at last they all but lost themselves in subtle distinctions and, bewildered by the dust of battle, actually “fought against their own side.” In the heat of conflict men not only lost their

way, but also lost their tempers, and applied to one another certain offensive and unmusical epithets such as "Phthartolatrae," "Aktistetes," "Aphthartodocetics," and "Ktistolators." It was an unhappy age, of which Dr. Bruce appropriately speaks as "the era of *anatomical* Christology."

And yet through all this strife, much of which seems so petty to the modern mind, there runs a sincerity of purpose that cannot be ridiculed. Men were bent upon a laudable undertaking—the rationalization of their faith. Primarily, therefore, the responsibility for these centuries of theological conflict may be laid upon the activity of the human mind in its passion for explanation. The pity was that men in their zeal for rationalization often lost sight of the historic facts of faith because they were willing to surrender what they could not immediately rationalize. Furthermore, yielding overmuch to the philosophic tendency of the age, they sought a metaphysical rather than a moral rationale for the Incarnation. As a result, the humanity of Christ was sadly neglected, and by some was reduced to a bare metaphysical shell in order to fit certain *a priori* notions of what Deity could or could not do.

It was left for the Reformation, and particularly for the leaders of the Reformed Church, to recall the minds of men once again to the real humanity of our Lord. To these men the Christ of faith was the Saviour of the Gospels; one who had lived, suffered, and died; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, tempted in all points like as we are; a true Saviour, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmity. Yet, with all this insistence upon the real humanity of Jesus, the Reformers yield nothing to the Socinian tendencies of their day. If to them He is "the man Christ Jesus," He is also

nothing less than "God over all blessed forever." The veil of inadequate and mystifying Christological solutions is stripped away, and men are called back to the more simple faith of the early church. But this return to the primitive faith is also a return to the old problem which had exercised the Fathers, but was never solved by them: How can we reconcile true Deity and real humanity in the historic Jesus?

It may be said with assurance that the Reformed theologians did not solve this problem. Their chief contribution to a Biblical Christology was a determined insistence upon both the humanity and Deity of our Lord, and also a refusal to entertain as valid any view of His Person which failed to pay due regard to all the facts as set forth in the New Testament sources and confirmed by their own personal experience. This position was of inestimable value to the Christian church, not in forbidding further attempts to formulate a rational Christology, but in providing a sure foundation upon which men might work.

If prior to the Reformation the general tendency was to sacrifice the humanity of Jesus in the interest of certain conceptions of Deity, we may say that since the Reformation there has been a tendency in an opposite direction. Especially has this been true during the last seventy-five years, a period characterized by great critical activity. Like the blind man of the Fourth Gospel, this historical criticism began with "the man that is called Jesus," next advanced to the point of recognizing Him as "a prophet," and finally, in the case of some critics at least, fell down and worshiped Him.

Those who recognized Him as divine solved the inevitable Christological problem by having recourse to some form of *kenosis* theory. In becoming man the

Logos "emptied himself" in some respect. Thus, the divinity was made to yield, or rather was adjusted, to the humanity. In adopting this principle of a kenosis as a point of departure in attempted explanations of Christ's Person, men were on safe and Biblical ground, for the New Testament writings undoubtedly teach a kenosis of some kind in their doctrine of the Incarnation. Unfortunately, in the application of this valid principle, men failed to keep their eyes steadfastly upon the historic Person; the kenosis idea became a tool of theological bias, and was used for the construction of strange kenotic Christs bearing but a poor and partial resemblance to the Christ of the Gospel records.

This was the era of the modern kenotic theories, during which, as might be expected, searching and critical examination was given to every New Testament passage that could possibly be utilized in their support. The Philippian passage naturally received most attention, being in fact the exegetical cornerstone of the whole kenosis idea. Certain extremists, it is true, simply ignored it in the construction of their Christological schemes; but all those who felt bound in any real sense to the New Testament records rightly understood that no formula could be regarded as valid which failed to gain the support of this important text. One having but a superficial acquaintance with the many different kenotic theories is not surprised, therefore, to find some diversity of opinion among interpreters. He will be scarcely prepared, however, for the actual situation.

Nothing beyond a cursory review of the astonishingly numerous interpretations of this Philippian passage is enough, as someone has suggested, to afflict the student with "intellectual paralysis." This is especially the case in regard to that section (v. 7) which speaks of the

“self-emptying,” or kenosis, of Christ. Some make of this a mere *skēnosis*; Deity was veiled, but was limited in no important or essential respect. Others think the self-limitation was real, though very inconsiderable. A third view holds that the Logos, in becoming man, retained full possession of His divine attributes, and that the kenosis consisted in His acting as if He did not possess them. Another school supposes that He actually gave up certain of His attributes, the ones designated by theologians as relative, such as omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. Still others go farther in asserting that He gave up all the divine attributes, so that Deity was stripped to a bare essence. Finally, there are those who, excluding from the passage all reference to a pre-existent state, regard the kenosis as having taken place wholly within the earthly life of the man Christ Jesus.

Such a variety of interpretations might tend to discourage any further attempt were it not for one thing, namely, a hopeful conviction that much of this variety may have been caused by different theological viewpoints which interpreters brought with them to the passage. This is not to say, that we must begin with no assumptions. I feel quite sure that certain regulative presuppositions are essential to any worthwhile exposition of our Lord’s kenosis as set forth in this Philippian text. Some of these presuppositions I shall now attempt to state.

1. No interpretation can be accepted as valid which departs in any respect from the historic Person of the Gospel records.
2. Due consideration should be given to the whole stream of Biblical testimony which bears on the Person of Christ. If the Philippian text is worthy of attention, then other texts may not be excluded.
- 3.

The interpreter will logically expect to receive his surest guidance from the writer of the passage, the Apostle Paul himself. 4. It is supremely important that the purpose and spirit of the passage with its context be kept constantly in mind. The writer of this passage is not composing a theological treatise; he is pleading with his Philippian converts for a life of love and self-forgetfulness—"not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others." And as a powerful incentive to this holy end he holds up before their eyes the sublime Self-forgetfulness of the Son of Man, who on their behalf had "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant." 5. If metaphysical difficulties arise, they must yield to the moral requirements of the Incarnation. We ought to be, I think, well past that stage of human thought when such difficulties compelled men to choose between an "Absolute" who could not empty Himself, and a mere creature who had little or nothing of which he might empty himself. Better a thousand times give up our conception of an absolute God than admit He is incapable of any real "moral heroism." For that matter, what God can or cannot do is a question to be settled by what we have good reason to believe that He has done. Therefore, no supposed metaphysical problems should be permitted to reduce the doctrine of our Lord's kenosis to the point where it becomes a mere shadowy, docetic semblance.

The passage appears in the American Standard Version as follows: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becom-

ing obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

The first question concerns the phrase, "existing in the form of God." Does it refer to a pre-existent state of Christ? To the casual reader such a reference seems perfectly natural, but some have denied it, affirming that the reference is limited to the earthly state of Christ. This was the position taken by certain interpreters, although for vastly different reasons; by some of them to vindicate their doctrine of an omnipresent body; by others to avoid a possible testimony for the Saviour's Deity. Various arguments were advanced in support of this interpretation.

It was said that the subject of the entire passage is named "Christ Jesus," and that, even granting a pre-existent state, such a title would be inappropriate to designate the Logos prior to His Incarnation. To me this objection has little weight. Even common usage is against it; no one thinks it inaccurate, for instance, to speak of the "childhood of President Coolidge," though, strictly speaking, *President* Coolidge had no childhood. And the objection fails utterly when we find the Apostle Paul applying the historical Name to the Son of God in other passages where the reference to His pre-existent state is unmistakable. (*Cf.* Heb. 11:26 and 1 Cor. 10:4, "the rock was Christ.")

Again, it has been argued that a disquisition upon the pre-existence of Christ is not within the scope of the Apostle's purpose, that he is interested only in setting before his converts an example of unselfishness and true humility. To this we can heartily agree, insisting at the same time, however, that this very purpose of the writer is a strong argument for the reference to a pre-existent state. What an example to set before self-seeking

Christians—the eternal Son stooping from Heaven to earth on behalf of men! Certainly, assuming that Paul believed in a pre-existent state, it would be hard to explain his failure to employ the idea in a passage like this one. As to the rather shallow objection that such an example would be beyond the power of men to imitate, we may answer that this is to miss the spirit of the passage altogether. The Apostle is not asking for any mechanical imitation of the precise act in which our Lord “emptied himself,” whatever that act may have involved. He is pleading that men shall have in them “the mind” which was in Christ Jesus, and which impelled Him so to act as the passage describes, in the interest of others. Moreover, to exclude the idea of pre-existence from the passage is to render obscure its meaning.

The early Christian church was familiar with this idea, and a reference to it in connection with the act of Incarnation would need no explanation. It was part of the common faith. But if we eliminate this idea, and make the “self-emptying” something that took place entirely within the earthly life of Christ, at once the plea of the Apostle becomes vague and unintelligible. To what particular act in His earthly life could the language of verses 6-7 be applied with any measure of certainty beyond mere guess-work? And why is there no hint or clue to guide the reader in fixing upon it? True, His whole life was characterized by a constant and gracious “self-forgetfulness,” but the aorist tense here (*ἐκένωσεν*) seems to favor a definite act, once for all, and not simply a habit of living. The conclusion, to me, is compelling: The Apostle speaks of the one act which needed no explanation to the Philippian Christians, that sublime and voluntary act of Incarnation wherein the

"Word became flesh and tabernacled among us" in servant-form. The high background of this act is set forth in the phrase, "existing in the form of God," a phrase which not only refers to a pre-existent state, but also has somewhat to say regarding its character.

This pre-existent state is characterized as "in the form of God" (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ). The general meaning of *μορφή* is *external* appearance, that form by which a person or thing strikes the vision. Our English word "form" scarcely expresses its full significance. Quite often we use this term to indicate the very opposite of reality, saying of something, that it is only a form, by which we mean that the external appearance of the thing is misleading and does not truly represent the inner substance or character. Thus, some have argued, Christ was a form of God; He was God-like, but not God. The word *μορφή* seems to strike deeper than this. Lightfoot, Trench, Bengel, and others argue convincingly, against a number who think otherwise, that the *μορφή*-form is something intrinsic and essential as opposed to the *σχῆμα*-form which is merely outward and more or less accidental. Following this idea S. G. Green, in his *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament*, defines *μορφή* as the form which is "indicative of the interior nature." It is indeed external form, that which strikes the eye, but as such it accurately represents the underlying nature from which it springs.

If this be the significance of the term, then to say that Christ Jesus was "existing in the form of God" is to affirm that He was very God manifesting Himself in some external form through which He could be known, probably to the inhabitants of Heaven, for what He truly was. This meaning of *μορφή* in verse 6 is further confirmed by its usage in verse 7 where we are told that

Christ took the "form of a servant." Are we to understand from this assertion that He became a servant only in external appearance, and not in fact? Very few would be willing to accept such a representation; certainly none of those who wish to limit the word in verse 6 to mere external form. They have insisted more than once upon what we gladly accept, that the Saviour was true man and in all respects a true servant of God on behalf of men. But if the phrase, "form of a servant," can be taken to indicate a true servanthood, surely no one may consistently forbid us to find true Deity in the phrase, "form of God."

Returning now to the general meaning of the word *μορφή*, an external form which strikes the vision, let us ask this question, Does the invisible God possess such a form? Are we to take the meaning literally, or is the reference only to those divine attributes in the exercise of which intelligent beings may know that God is God? The latter idea is undoubtedly present, and is the important one, as I shall try to show below under a discussion of verse 7, but I do not believe that the more literal meaning should be excluded. "No man hath seen God at any time." True, yet we read that "Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel" went up into the mountain, and "they saw the God of Israel." And we have the cry of the prophet Isaiah, "Woe is me . . . for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts." Whom and what did these men see? I am inclined to believe they saw the Son "existing in the form of God," that form which strikes the vision and is at the same time no mere *εἶδος*, or superficial resemblance, but which is rather truly indicative of God's inner nature and invisible substance.

The Apostle now proceeds to set before his Philip-

pian converts the mind of Him who was originally existing in the form of God. This mind is revealed in two sublime self-renunciatory acts, the one described as a *kenosis*, the other as a *tapeinosis*. In the former He "emptied himself," stooping from God to humanity; in the latter He "humbled himself," stooping from humanity to death. The *kenosis* is further exhibited from two distinct viewpoints: First, from the pre-existent state of Christ—"He counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped"; and second, from His earthly state—"taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men."

The phrase, "being on an equality with God," is exegetical and explanatory of the phrase, "existing in the form of God." The only question is, whether these two phrases are exactly equivalent, or whether the former adds to the latter the important idea of actual historical manifestation. This second interpretation is very suggestive and is not lacking in considerations which support it, but I prefer the first as more in harmony with the entire viewpoint of this article. In the mind of the writer, then, to exist "in the form of God" is to be "equal with God," whatever else may be in the latter phrase. Absolute equality with God was the possession of Jesus in His pre-incarnate state. But, when the need arose in the world for a Saviour, He did not regard His being equal with God "a thing to be grasped" as a robber might grasp an object not his own. This "equality" with God was so surely and incontestably Christ's own possession that He could, with "royal un-anxiety," lay it aside for a season for our sakes, being fully assured that it would return to Him once He had accomplished our redemption. In all this there is a blessed contrast between the

mind of the Son and the mind of the great adversary of our souls. The latter once counted the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped as a robber grasps at that which is not his own. Being in the form of a servant, this "son of the morning" said in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God . . . , I will make myself like the Most High." But the only begotten Son, "existing in the form of God" and possessing full "equality with God," counted all this not a thing to be grasped, "but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men."

Here we have the positive side of the kenosis. There are not three steps, as the Authorized Version seems to indicate, but only one step, in which the Logos "emptied himself." This self-emptying act is further qualified by two participial phrases. The first exhibits the great ethical end of the kenosis: Christ emptied Himself to become a servant, the Servant of Jehovah. He therefore takes servant-form. But there are various servant-forms; angels are *δοῦλοι Θεοῦ*. So the second clause specifies the nature of His servant-form: He took not on Him the nature of angels, but was made lower than the angels, "becoming in the likeness of men" (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*).

Such in general was the kenosis of our Lord, and we may now enquire whether it be possible to define more specifically its content. Of what primarily did the Son of God empty Himself when He entered upon His earthly history? The passage before us does not supply the details needed for a satisfactory answer. All it affirms is that Christ Jesus was originally existing in "the form of God," and that at a certain point in time He emptied Himself, taking "the form of a servant."

Of His existence in servant-form we know somewhat, having the Gospel records to guide us. Regarding His existence in God-form our knowledge is more limited. If we could fix upon the exact significance of this phrase, "in the form of God," the problem would be solved, because in the kenosis this "form" was exchanged for the form of a servant. If we knew all that it meant to be in the form of God, we would then know what our Lord gave up in order to take the form of a servant. Everything in fact depends upon how we define the "form of God." I have already discussed to a limited extent the possible meaning of this phrase, and shall attempt now to investigate it more exhaustively.

In the first place, the form of God must not be identified with the essential nature of God. Many of the Fathers did so identify them, probably out of a desire to gain this Philippian passage as a witness to the Deity of Christ. The motive was praiseworthy, but in permitting it to sway their exegetical judgment they got into a Christological dilemma from which they were unable to extricate themselves without either admitting that God could cease to be God, or on the other hand explaining away the reality of the kenosis. In the main, as we might expect, they chose the latter way out. The form of God in this passage is not the nature of God. God-form certainly presupposes a God-nature, but is not essential to it. Verse 7 draws a similar distinction on the human side of the kenosis; there is here a servant-form and also a human-nature. The nature is a necessary condition of the form, but the form is not essential to the nature. A man may cease to be a servant, but he cannot cease to be a man. Likewise, Deity may change form, but not nature.

I have suggested above that this "form of God" may

include a reference to some literal external appearance, but doubtless the more important reference is to the divine attributes. For it is through the exercise or function of these that, from an external viewpoint, God appears most truly as God. In this functioning we find, in the deepest sense, the *μορφή* of God. The Logos, then, in putting off this form, must have experienced to some degree a limitation as to His exercise of the divine attributes. The question is, What was the nature and extent of this limitation? He could not, as some suggest, have actually surrendered the divine attributes, for they are functions potential in the very nature of God. Granted that the *active* functioning might cease for a time, still the *potentiality* remains. To suggest that this might also be given up is to say that God may cease to be God.

But such an idea is repugnant to reason, and surely cannot be discovered in the Scriptures. On the contrary, our Lord during the days of His flesh very definitely asserts His possession of divine power when, referring to the laying down of His life, He declares, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." It will not do, either, to say, as some others have said, that the Logos gave up the *use* of the divine attributes during the period of His earthly life, though if interpreted rightly this statement might be accepted as a true account. It is better to say with Dr. Strong that Christ gave up the *independent use* of His divine attributes. This leaves room for all those exhibitions of divine power and knowledge which appear during His earthly ministry, and at the same time modifies in no essential respect the doctrine of a real kenosis.

We may say, then, that the eternal Son, existing in the form of God—robed with the glory of Deity in its

external manifestation, possessing and exercising all the incommunicable functions of the true God—counted not this being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but with loving condescension emptied Himself, taking servant-form; and as a result of this one act His whole earthly life became the life of a bond-servant, in which he does nothing, speaks nothing, knows nothing *by Himself*; but all is under the power and direction of the Father through the Holy Spirit. In this sense, during His earthly sojourn, the “external glory” was utterly laid aside. “He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” But there was another, an *inner* glory; and this glory, of which the external glory had been indicative, was still present, though veiled by the servant-form. He did not—it is not too much to say that He could not—empty Himself of this. And to those who came to know Him because their eyes were enlightened by the Spirit, His blessed inner glory became apparent in spite of the veil of flesh, so that they could witness that, “The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father) full of grace and truth.”

The two phrases, “in the likeness of men” and “in fashion as a man,” might seem to suggest an unreal, docetic view of Christ’s humanity if we were dependent upon these alone for our doctrine of the Incarnation. Fortunately we have the whole testimony of the Gospel records to guide us in the interpretation of these expressions, and this testimony affirms that the humanity of our Lord was real. The Apostle’s reason for speaking as he does in this text is not to insinuate that Christ was not true man, but probably to remind his readers that there is after all a difference between the man Jesus and

man who is a sinner. Sinfulness is not a *necessary* characteristic of humanity, though it happens to be a *universal* characteristic of the humanity that we know. Because this last is so, men are in the habit of regarding sinfulness and humanity as correlative terms. Who has not heard that hoary-headed excuse for the sinner, "Well, he is only human"? We have here, I think, a sufficient explanation of Paul's use of such terms as "likeness" and "fashion" in his reference to Christ's humanity; it is the guarded language of inspiration upon a theme where a misstep may invite confusion. (Compare the careful phrase in Rom. 8:3.)

To the New Testament writers Christ is a real man made "in all things like unto his brethren," yet we are not to forget there is a difference; we are sinners, but He is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners." Aside from this there is no limit in His kenosis. He becomes partaker of "flesh and blood"; is born of a woman under the law; grows in wisdom and in stature; is often hungry and weary; meets temptation, not as God, but as man, "being tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"; learns "obedience by the things which he suffered"; knows not the day of His second coming. Yet these limitations, self-imposed as they were, do not open the way for any dishonoring views regarding His trustworthiness as a teacher; they do not make of Him the fallible Jewish rabbi of Modernism. Such inferences from the kenosis are hasty and superficial.

When He took upon Him servant-form, the Son of God came to be the *perfect* servant, to reveal the ideal servanthood. But the perfect servant must render a *perfect* service. Not many will care to affirm that our Lord failed at this point. He Himself could say: "I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I

speak these things. And he that hath sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." (John 8:28-29.) And again: "For I speak not from myself, but the Father that sent me, he hath given me commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (John 12:49). "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" (John 8:46). There is no room for fallibility here, whatever view we may take of Christ's humiliation. On the contrary, as Bishop Moule has pointed out, the kenosis itself becomes the *guarantee* of His infallibility. Whatever He was before entrance into human existence, by His "self-emptying" He becomes the perfect bond-servant of Jehovah, who does nothing and speaks nothing from Himself, but speaks only what the Father "commands," and does "always the things that are pleasing to him." Therefore, in the days of His flesh, the Son of Man may be trusted without reserve in every statement He has been pleased to make, for His words are in every instance the very words of God.

The great ethical end of the kenosis was servanthood. This conception arose in the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah; it was announced from the lips of our Lord Himself, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many"; it was exemplified throughout His whole earthly ministry, which might have been appropriately summed up in His own words, "I am among you as one who serveth." This is a prominent idea in both steps of His humiliation as set forth in the Philippian text. In the first step, as God, He had emptied Himself, taking the form of a *servant*. Then, as man, He humbled Himself, becoming *obedient* unto death.

An impressive thought in both of these steps is the

perfect *freedom* and *voluntariness* of the Son of God. No theory of the kenosis can be true which brings Him into an earthly state where it is impossible for Him to assert "equality with God." Room must be left for a "voluntary perseverance not to assert that equality, on the part of One Who could do otherwise." He assumed servant-form and died upon the cross for us, not because of any compulsion external to Himself, but according to the free and loving choice of His own will. "He was no Victim of a secret and irresistible destiny such as that which, in the Stoic's theology, swept the gods of Olympus to their hour of change and extinction as surely as it swept men to their ultimate annihilation." When He stooped to servanthood and death He did so with all the sovereign free will of One whose choices are limited only by His own holy and loving will. "He emptied *himself*." "He humbled *himself*."

This voluntary perseverance in that mind which led Him first to the kenosis and finally to the cross has an important bearing on the problem of His self-consciousness. It implies a certain continuity of self-consciousness throughout all the changes incident to His earthly state. He knew, while on earth, of His pre-existent state; He was aware of the mind which had actuated Him in exchanging the God-form for the servant-form; and He purposed to have "that mind in him" down to the last act in the great drama of redemption. "I *know* whence I came, and whither I go," He says to the Pharisees. And drawing near to the hour of death, He repels all suggestions of any possible change in His own eternal purpose by declaring steadily, "But for this cause came I unto this hour" (John 8:14; 12:27).

But the writer of the Philippian letter will not permit us to forget that, even while our blessed Lord was

acting in the manner of a sovereign (for such He was), He was also acting in filial obedience to the Father's will. In humbling Himself, He became "*obedient*" unto death. Not that He was obeying death when He died—death had no claim upon Him—but in dying He was obeying the Father whose bond-servant He had come to be. The thought is that He obeyed God so utterly as to die. Does not all this take us back in memory to that moment of the ages when the Son, entering into the world, announces, "Lo, I am come; in the roll of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O God"? Does it not take us back to Gethsemane, there to behold His agony and hear His triumphant cry, "Father, not my will, but thine be done"?

In the death of Christ there was a marvelous blending of *sovereign choice* and *utter obedience*. He humbled Himself unto death; yes, but He was also obedient unto death. Speaking of His approaching death, our Lord Himself blends these two things in a striking passage from chapter 10 of John's Gospel. "I lay down my life," He says, "that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" ("power" in each case in Greek is *ἐξουσίαν*. R. V. marg., "right"). Certainly this is sovereign choice. But let us read on: "This *commandment* received I from my Father."

Several years ago, while I was engaged in a study of the Philippian Epistle, a letter came to me bearing news of the death of a friend and former classmate who had laid down his life for Christ in foreign missionary service. He had been a brilliant student, was wealthy in his own right, and at the completion of the seminary course he was married to a beautiful and talented young

woman. In this country he might have had everything ordinarily desirable to men—business success, comfort, ease, and luxury. But there was in him the mind of Christ; if I may dare to use the words reverently, he freely “emptied himself” of all these prospects, becoming a servant of the cross in Egypt. There, having given what he could in service, he was obedient “unto death.”

But the free obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ rises above all human comparison. He was indeed obedient unto death, but more than that, *even* unto the death of the cross. After all, the death of my friend was only a joyful “loosing away upward” to be with the Christ whose he was and whom he served. There were no pangs, no sting, in death for him. How different was the death of the cross! That was a “death of unimaginable pain and utmost shame, a death which to the Jew was a symbol of the curse of God, and to the Roman was a horror of degradation.” Nor was this all. It was a death in which all the pent up wrath of the law against human sin would fall upon the blessed head of Jehovah’s Servant, a death in which He must plumb the depths of “a soul that’s lost.” None of this was hid from His eyes. Having counted the cost, for our sakes “He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, *even* the death of the cross.”

NOTE

One determining factor in various interpretations of the Philippian passage has been the central problem of the Incarnation, namely, What is the relation of the divine to the human in the historic Christ? The Apostle Paul certainly must have known that his statement would raise this problem but, like other New Testament

writers, makes no attempt to solve it. In the main, the writers of Scripture are content to assert the reality of the two natures in Christ, without attempting a rationalization of their doctrine. Perhaps it is wisdom to leave the matter as they have left it. One hesitates to enter a field of controversy where so many well-intentioned men have slipped into errors ranging from an Apollinarian denial of any human soul in the Saviour to the Nominalistic doctrine of two wills and two minds—in fact, two persons. But the church has been compelled to enter this field by reason of the deviations of those who oftentimes were numbered among her own sons. At Chalcedon (451) the church declared that in the Saviour there are two natures, one divine and the other human. These two natures are perfectly and organically united in one Person, yet they remain distinct, each retaining its complete integrity. We must neither “confound the natures, nor divide the Person.” The seat of personality in this Person is the Logos, the eternal Son.

The main criticism of this formula, from the standpoint of the older psychology, was how Christ could have but one personality, if in Him there were two distinct natures, namely, the human soul and the Logos-spirit. Did not the soul of a man constitute a personality in itself? The ancient church never wholly succeeded in answering this rather formidable objection, but nevertheless wisely refused to alter the formula. Her position is now being vindicated, I believe, by the latest pronouncements of modern psychology. The personality—also the mind—we are told, is not metaphysical, but is *built up* by the interaction constantly taking place between the living organism and its environment. I cannot, of course, accept this statement

in toto. There is certainly a metaphysical basis for both mind and personality. But with this reservation, the account seems to be true, and may be of service in aiding us toward an understanding of the Person of Christ. The Logos, in becoming flesh, was united with a true human soul in the body born of the Virgin Mary. This soul on the human side provided a basis for the possible *building up* of a human mind and personality, and the building up process was perfectly normal in all respects, except that it took place around and in vital union with the Logos-spirit now emptied of His divine form. (Dr. Strong seems to suggest the above view of personality when he says, "*Nature* has consciousness and will only as it is manifested in *person*."—Systematic Theology, p. 695.)

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA.

SHECHEM AND THE HISTORICITY OF JACOB

By BISHOP H. M. DU BOSE

ALTHOUGH much is inferable from a surface reading of the Scriptures concerning the importance of the name and place of Jacob in the story of the Israelitish people, the pivotal relationship of his personality and history to the problems of Old Testament interpretation and criticism never has been fully realized. This relationship will be found to reach to such elemental Pentateuchal questions as the ideal of the theocracy and the unity of the shrine and the secular authority, or the simultaneous institution in the wilderness of the sacrifice and the Mosaic law, which, at a glance, the practiced Bible student will recognize as the crux of Old Testament criticism. The historicity of Jacob, on the basis of the Genesis record, being established, the way to a critical proof of ancient Scripture unity becomes clear. The purpose of this writing is to relate the proofs of that historicity and to assess the critical value of a series of facts which emerged at a given time in the life of the patriarch. The centrifugal of my argument is the testimony of the stones, tablets, and pottery of the Amorite fundiments of Shechem.

The evidence of the historicity of Jacob has been strengthened tremendously by the results of the archeological work being prosecuted at Shechem. So far as uncovered, the deeper ruins of that ancient Amorite capital have justified the hope which has slowly turned in that direction. In articles printed in **THE BIBLICAL**

REVIEW within the last two years I have given some account of the progress of the surprising and comforting outcome of this Shechem uncovering, particularly as it has borne upon the record of primeval monotheism set forth in the earlier chapters of Genesis.

In addition to the work done at this site in 1926, Dr. Sellin of the University of Berlin, the chief promoter of the task, was able to put in several months of the late summer and autumn of 1927 in further pushing the advance through the complex of the three great civilization remains of the *tell*, adding additional and indubitable proofs of the identity and antiquity of the mighty mass which so long has escaped the attention of historians and archeologists. The results continue to bear testimony to the Scriptural claims made for the residence here of both Abraham and Jacob. Among the objects retrieved in 1926 were two cuneiform tablets of the age of the Tel-el-Amarna writings, and barely missing the time of Jacob.

What is of the greatest significance is that the tablets found at Shechem were contractual compacts, and of the character of what, no doubt, was written on a similar tablet given to Jacob in receipt for the purchase money paid for the field bought by him of Hamor, the father of Shechem. That some such tablets, directly relating to Jacob or Abraham, repose somewhere in the vast remaining heaps of Shechem, I can scarcely question. I also look wonderingly forward to the uncovering of the necropolis of Shechem which, without doubt, was used by both Abraham and Jacob in entombing their feudal dead, Abraham having acquired sepulture rights therein, as declared by St. Stephen in his defense before the Jewish Sanhedrin (Acts 7:16).

Those radical critics who have not hastened to ad-

judge to Jacob a simple eponymous relation to the Hebrew race have generally conceived of him as being merely a link in a genealogy beginning in supposititious history. His residence at Shechem usually has been passed over with inattention, and its record has seemed rather a personal than a representative one. Thus a militant and prophetic chapter in human history, when considered at all, has been mistaken for an idyl. A gesture toward empire in the Shechem stay has been misinterpreted into a pastoral episode; the ideals of a man of passionate moods and creative intellect have been replaced with the role of a breeder of sheep and a herder of cattle; but the facts unfold with a sudden, new day interest. Jacob's personality and his Shechem record not only exhibit the norm of the Israelitish national concept and program, but, when considered in the light of Pentateuchal statement and the results of archeology, become, as already indicated, critical precedents of the highest value.

The birthright for which Jacob struggled, even in prenatal unconsciousness, and which he at last secured through superior acumen, if still by means not over-scrupulous, was not a mere title to primogeniture, but was the personal incarnation of a racial ideal that looked to the correlatives of spiritual apprehension and political mastery. The national shrine and the framework of the state in the unity of the theocracy described the most ancient program of Israel; and Jacob was its first distinct exponent, as Shechem was the place where, in his initiative, the earliest attempt was made to realize it. That attempt had continuity; it was not a fortuitous circumstance that Joshua, after the conquest, gathered the people together at Shechem to take up the program of Jacob in proclaiming the realization of the ideal of

the shrine and the state. Shechem was to have been what Jerusalem later became, the seat of government and worship, and had been so, except for unforeseen tribal dissonance.

Of the primal concerns of Israel, political authority and the cultic ritual, the political was always the more distinct and constant; but the cultic or spiritual was counted as pre-eminent, and also as forming the condition upon which the political was to be realized and maintained. In spiritual perception Jacob may have been a spiritual adolescent, and this perforce of his time; but he was strong in spiritual potentialities, and from the beginning was apt in the qualities of foresight and material mastery. This outline of his figure grows more distinct in the light of the uncoverings at Shechem.

The twenty years which Jacob spent in the house of Laban at Padan-aram developed his aptitude in the handling of his own material fortunes, as it also deepened his religious sense, a slowly enlarging and settling conception of the unity and spirituality of the Deity. His was not a struggle out of fetichism or polytheism into monotheism, but a struggle to retain the concept of that primal and elemental monotheism which had descended to him through family transmissions from the earliest traditions of the Semitic races. We now must see that it was this struggle that brought the rupture with Laban, and eventuated in the *trek* toward the fatherland. It also was this struggle that culminated in the vision at Peniel, and that eventually, through his new impulses, led him to Shechem instead of to the Beersheba hinterland, as had been his purpose.

No analysis of Jacob's motive, as no appraisalment of his history, would be complete without taking into account his sudden change of plan at the Jabbok ford.

That change of plan was the result of a cumulative experience. The desert silences through which he passed from the house of Laban to the hill of Peniel, so favorable to contemplation and mental quickening, turned the Canaanward journey into a progressive revelation. The balsam trees of Mt. Gilead burned with tokens of coming mystery, while angels of challenge stepped from impinging mirages.

At Padan-aram Jacob had become a feudal householder of much wealth and importance. His holdings and personal station were of such glamour as to provoke from his envious kinsmen the description, "all this glory." It is evident from the face of the Bible narrative that Jacob sought the building up of his material fortunes not as an end, but as a means. He was ever a stranger in the land of his exile; his heart and his ideals belonged to the land of promise; his birthright, bought as the price of a long banishment, was never forgotten. Years before his stealing away from Laban he had separated himself into a distinct habitat and had there set up an authority of his own.

It is safe to say that, at the time of his setting forth from Padan-aram, Jacob's pastoral household, inclusive of his harem, consisted of scarcely fewer than two thousand souls. Abraham had been able to raise from the servants of his household, born and trained in his own camp, three hundred and eighteen fighting men. The safe military rule of five civilians to each war-capable male would show the community of Abraham to have consisted of fifteen hundred and ninety souls. It can easily be shown that the retainers of Jacob at the Jabbok exceeded this number. The test is in the manner in which he divided his herdsmen into two bands to meet the four hundred men who had come with Esau from

Mt. Seir. The Hebrew word here used for "band" is *mahaneh*, plural *mahanoth*. It is constantly used in the Old Testament in a military and semimilitary sense. The Septuagint translates the passage here referred to (Gen. 32:1) with the use of *παρεμβολή*, which is the word for an armed camp. The idea is emphasized in the suggestion that Jacob felt that his "two bands" were equal in fighting prowess to the four hundred mountaineers of Esau; and we shall later see how thoroughly the herdsmen of Jacob were trained in the use of the sword and the bow. These observations find emphasis in the unfolded story of Shechem.

The purpose of Jacob in leaving the house and service of Laban was undoubtedly influenced by religious convictions, as was true in the case of Abraham in leaving Haran; but Jacob's object was also patriotic, which is to say, political. The struggle going on within him at this time was abetted by divine manifestations. At the Jabbok this struggle reached a stage of coherency. There he changed his destination from the desert steppes of Beersheba to the populous valley terrain of Shechem. Here begins a history which is tangible and significant in itself, and which, as already suggested, offers an exact hypothesis concerning important questions in Pentateuchal interpretation.

The approach of Esau from Mt. Seir with apparently hostile intentions drove Jacob to prayer, and brought on the contest with the angel of Peniel. That contest was not only the trying out of a personal cause with Jehovah; it was the onset of history in a violent taking of the Kingdom of God. In its issue was brought to settlement the destiny of mankind. Through the divine investiture Jacob that night became a prince; and also that night his imperiled feudal camp became a

people, a nation. It was the historic beginning of Israel. The theophany met responsive human conditions. In the diminutive state there helped to birth were homogeneity of blood and cohesion of spirit. These herdsmen were Semitic kinsmen of Jacob, of his wives and his concubines. They were all of the Abrahamic family, descendants of Terah. This fact came to Jacob as an inspiration. In a moment, as it were, the whole future of his program was re-oriented. The unity of the shrine and the state rose in realization, no longer through the vision light of Bethel, but through the impending actualities of Shechem.

The time had now come to take possession of the land promised to his grandfather Abraham. Upon this promise he would at once begin to realize, not through force, but through a process of peaceful occupation and generation, a program of temporal mathematic, rather than of militant, aggression. The thought was worthy of a world builder; and, although time proved its direct impracticability, its significance and impact were not lost to subsequent history.

Having settled matters with Esau, but closely keeping his own counsel, Jacob turned directly westward from the ford of the Jabbok and pitched in the valley of Succoth, facing one of the main and already ancient crossings of the Jordan. A distance of less than two days journey westward lay the Amorite city of Shechem, which now became his goal. The recognized importance of Shechem had caused Abraham to make it his first stopping place in Canaan, when coming out of Haran. In the time of both Abraham and Jacob it was the capital of whatever government or influence related the Amorite people of the west land in a unity of ideal or effort. It was the place which particularly favored

Jacob's scheme of conquest through generation. He would now make it his capital and the seat of Israel's national shrine.

Crossing the Jordan, after possibly two years of rest and recuperation in the valley of Succoth, he suddenly appeared with his caravan on the eastern border of the valley of Shechem. With his well trained herds-men soldiery he pitched at a place called Shalem, near the base of Mt. Ebal. This Shalem, by some, is identified with an existing small Arab village which approximates the logical site of its Bible predecessor. From this station, Jacob entered into successful, though, we must say, constrained realty negotiations with the Shechemites. The "parcel of land" which he obtained must have been of considerable extent, including a wide stretch of valley and a formidable reach of mountain scarp.

On a calculation, having regard for the emergence in force heretofore indicated, I undertook, in 1926, a personal survey of the probable boundaries of Jacob's land portion at Shechem. Taking the reputed tomb of Joseph, or even the verified site of Jacob's well, as a landmark, this freehold stretched from near the walls of Shechem for a distance of one and one-half miles along the eastern face of Gerizim, and embraced indeterminate portions of the underlying valley. The present day aspect of this tract, and its relation to the now being uncovered city, strongly suggest an element of constraint in the details of its purchase. For, although Jacob should have adhered to his policy of nonaggression, the militaristic character of his camp and the presumptions suggested by the extent of his flocks and herds were an instant recommendation of his wishes. It is evident that no item of his request was denied.

Securely settled in his tiny principality, the token of coming nationality, Jacob established the shrine in convenient relation to his feudal holdings. The designation of this shrine as *El-Elohe-Israel*, "God, the God of Israel," must be recognized as significant of anticipated nationality. No other altar dedicated by either Abraham or Jacob was given so significant a designation. The altar site at Bethel was called *El-Bethel*, "the God of Bethel"; but the Shechem altar was to celebrate the God of *Israel*, the national Jehovah, later to be revealed to Moses. Within the gates of Shechem, six furlongs away, was the shrine of *El-berith*, the same monotheistic *El*, worshiped by the early postdiluvians as the *covenant* God (*berith* meaning "covenant"), almost certainly a monotheistic shrine at the time of Abraham.¹ Possibly the patriarch sacrificed there at his earliest coming to Shechem, as he did at the altar of *El-elyon*, at the monotheistic shrine of Melchizedek at Salem. However, here, on Jacob's freehold, the world *El* was to be worshiped as the God of Israel. Thus did the Israelitish state and shrine emerge together. Pragmatism can never separate the ritual of the altar from the code of the law. The Pentateuch was written in miniature at Shechem.

¹ The student will note that the form, *El-berith*, does not occur in our English Bible; but in Judges 9:46, from which only *Berith* is derived by our English translators, the Hebrew reads *El-berith*. This reading is followed by the Septuagint which has *Βαρθηλβεϑ*, "the house of El-berith." Jerome (in the Vulgate), Luther, and the King James versionists mistook *El* for a polytheistic term, in the verse cited, and so rendered it *deus*, *gott*, and *god*. The background of the Shechem uncovering was absent. But the textual aspect of the Hebrew is favorable to my view that the temple site discovered at Shechem was originally that of a monotheistic shrine. In Judges 8:33 it is recorded that "as soon as Gideon was dead, the children of Israel . . . made *Baal-berith* their god." In Judges 9:4 it is told how Abimelech, the usurper, received seventy pieces of silver out of the house of *Baal-berith* at Shechem; while, when the desperate inhabitants of that same Shechem sought refuge in that temple, they chose to remember it by its ancient and holier title of *El-berith*, "the house of the covenant God."

It would seem that during the first stage of Jacob's Shechem residence, a period of not less than ten years, his plans prospered and that he enjoyed to a growing extent the favor of his neighbors. From at first regarding him as an invader, they came to esteem him as a fellow citizen; and, no doubt, they were much mollified by reason of the extensive barter and exchange which they had with his growing establishment.

At the beginning Jacob's herdsmen would have depended for their water supply upon the abundant springs which break from the slopes of Mt. Gerizim. But the inconvenience of reaching these springs, as also the fact that they were constantly haunted by cattle poachers and robbers, suggested to Jacob the digging of a well in the valley at the front of his freehold. But the digging of this well has a far deeper significance than a temporal convenience. It emphasized the thought of Israelitish settlement and stability. Next to a fortress, a well was the most stabilizing institution of antiquity, and this well is without parallel in the history of antiquity; the Shechemites had entered upon no such enterprise. It is possibly nine feet in diameter, and sunk through eighty-five feet of obdurate limestone. The "throat" of the well would admit of only two workmen digging at once. These workmen, supplied, as they were, with only primitive tools, would have required from one to two years to accomplish the work. This alone speaks of foresight and statecraft.

The chronology of the period between the departure of Jacob from Padan-aram and his leaving Shechem adjusts itself, within safe limits. I have calculated the stay at Shechem as extending over ten years; it could not have been less; it may have been longer. At the time of leaving the house of Laban, the eldest son of

Jacob, Reuben, was a lad of twelve years, while Dinah, his sister, was an infant of only one year. At the end of the Shechem stay, the older sons of Jacob were far passed the years of adolescence, being referred to as "men" in the record, and their sister had become a woman of marriageable age. Two years were spent at Succoth, while another probably was spent at Shalem in negotiations, which would have brought Dinah to the age of fifteen. These figures are interesting, and all the more so since they are calculated on a basis of all but exact chronology.

The unhappy and unexpected circumstance of the deflowering of the young Dinah ended the hope of peaceful Israelitish conquest through generation, and brought on a situation of strife and blood. Like her Grecian sister, Helen of Troy, the young Hebrew princess through her wantonness brought disaster to her people. When the Bible informs us that two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, brothers of Dinah, "took each man his sword and came upon the city boldly and slew all the males," the obvious meaning is that, in their onset of revenge, they employed their feudal retainers, some hundreds in numbers, no doubt; and at that not exhaustive of the entirety of the body of Jacob's armed herdsmen. So far as Simeon and Levi were concerned, the attack was as much of the spirit of conquest as it was of the spirit of inquisition. (See Gen. 49:5-7.)

The immediate result of the reprisal of the sons of Jacob on the prince of Shechem was the possession of his city, its rich tributary valleys and its contiguous mountain sides. They had made their anger a pretext for translating their father's program of peaceful acquisition into a program of violence. However he deprecated the foray and saw in its results the present

end of his vision of conquest, Jacob assumed corporate responsibility for the entire transaction and reckoned the conquest to constitute a permanent title. While dying in Egypt and blessing his sons he made direct and illuminating reference to this militaristic incident. In indicating a special allotment to Joseph he said, "Moreover, I have given to thee one portion [Hebrew, *one shechem*, that is, "one shoulder" or "portion of the sacrifice"] above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow" (Gen. 48:22). The play in this passage on the word *shechem*, "portion," makes the connection doubly certain.

The persistency with which Jacob clung to the accidental military title acquired by his house to the whole demesne of Shechem is significant. It passed to after generations which held that the acquisition of Shechem constituted a pre-eminent title to the entire territory of the Amorites. In this spirit Moses directed that the ancient covenants with Jehovah (*Elohe Israel*) should there be renewed and there the law reproclaimed and that it should be considered the head city of the land. This direction Joshua carried out immediately following the conquest.

But although the city and the immediate territory of the Shechemites thus early were brought into the hands of the Jacob family, the Amorite confederacy was too formidable successfully to be withstood. Discovering that the premature and unadvised action of his sons had awakened the wrath of the princes about him, Jacob faced the necessity of decisive action. After purging his establishment of incipient idolatry he removed to the safe retreat of Bethel, a twelve hours' caravan jour-

ney to the southward, and thus was postponed for four hundred years the Israelitish conquest of the land.

But the Shechem transition left behind it a history of the highest evidential value. For one thing, it exhibited the *Israel* beginning of the Hebrew people's traditions, a designation which has distinguished them through four thousand years of consecutive time. In the light of this beginning and continuity the theory of a non-wilderness, non-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch becomes centerless. The Mosaic wilderness program took up the suspended Shechem program of Jacob in the establishment of a cultic-political theocracy and the promulgation of an according law. The second was the exact echo, or fulfillment, of the first. From the years of Jacob's Shechem residence was left a residuum of fact and association of which no belated Jahvist or Elohist could have been aware, a residuum hidden in the ruins of the old Amorite capital. The scant and ingenuous record of Genesis has had to wait for the unfolding pages of another one of God's books—archeology. The results of the excavations at Shechem have set the personality and movements of Jacob in the clear light of historicity, and have related the details of his migration (shall I say, invasion?) story into a close and logical unity.

The excavations at Shechem, already described somewhat in detail in **THE BIBLICAL REVIEW**, have developed the fact that the curb of the well of Jacob, the most thoroughly identified Old Testament landmark in Palestine, is on the geological level of the recently uncovered gate of the tower of Shechem (Judges 9:46), the fundiments of which served each successive occupation down to the time of the Greek emperors. Over the existing pavement stones of this tower passed the feet

of Abraham and Jacob. The pottery test fixes the date within safe figures. The curbstone of Jacob's well lies below the surface of three to four meters of temporal accretions, and on the primitive rock surface. That the present curbstone is the original construction, there can be no doubt. It was designed by its builder to outlast the ages, and thereby to become a symbol of the eternity of his conquest. The gate of the tower of Shechem, dating probably from an early secondary stage of the city's history (approximately 2000-2300 B.C.) rests on the same geological surface as does the well curb. By every token the latter antedates the first half of the eighteenth century B.C., while the former goes three to four centuries farther back, possibly to 2100 B.C.

The very ancient Canaanitish palace uncovered, along with the gate and defense walls, shows signs of having been plundered and simultaneously destroyed. The adjacent pottery indicates a date coincident with the taking and sacking of the city by the sons of Jacob. But the city was almost immediately rebuilt, and that by its former Amorite inhabitants, or such as survived. Between the two stages of building there is no trace of foreign intrusion or influence. This agrees with the Genesis record that Jacob and his sons, almost immediately after the taking of the city, removed to Bethel, and that through fear of reprisal on the part of an Amorite confederacy.

This, so far as its ruins have been made to speak, is the testimony of Shechem to the historicity of Jacob; but the uncovering of Shechem is an unfinished task. About five-sevenths of the *tell* remains to be excavated; and this area includes the ancient necropolis, the most promising and wonder-inspiring heap in Palestine. Dr. Sellin, the heroic German archeologist, has given labori-

ous devotion to the work during parts of the past two years, as also for a time previous to the World War. The honor of having collaborated with him during the 1926 uncovering period remains one of the uplifting and faith-exalting experiences of my life. The reports of Dr. Sellin's work during the autumn of 1927 have been received and translated. They inspire the hope that hitherto unexpected results will be obtained, when sufficient funds can be found for laying bare the secrets of the detritus-covered necropolis piled against the flank of Mt. Gerezim.

I have scarcely dared to think, much less to speak or write, of what is possible to be brought from the sepulchers of Shechem. After a brief season, in 1926, spent with Dr. Fisher at Megiddo and witnessing the triumph achieved in uncovering the rock built tombs of that foil of Armageddon I have awaited with cumulative emotions the hour of entering into "the sepulchre which Abraham bought of Hamor, the father of Shechem." But, even before this triumph, the extent to which already adduced evidence bears on the Jacob ideals is apparent, and also is worthy a present consideration.

In his defense before the Jewish Sanhedrin, the martyr Stephen said: "So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he, and our fathers, and were carried over into Sychem [Shechem] and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem." This statement, since the time of Jerome and the early church fathers, has been a source of embarrassment to devout interpreters of Scripture, and in modern times has become the occasion of a bold and flippant criticism of Stephen and Luke. One or the other has been charged with ignorance of Old Testament history and fact. But in the light of

evidence presented in this paper, the resumé of Scripture and archeology bearing on Shechem, the statement of Stephen appears to be not only a citation of literal history, but is also illuminative of a wide reach of the early Hebrew record.

It seems but reasonable to allow to the stay of Abraham at Shechem a period of five to seven years; it could hardly have been short of that. Also the record accounts for an Abrahamic feudal household of more than fifteen hundred souls, and at the time of the Shechem residence the number was plus that of Lot, his family and his herdsmen. The deaths that must needs have occurred in so large an establishment during this space of time must have been numerous and constant. The ancient peoples, and especially the Hebrews, interred their dead either on high hillsides or in rock built sepulchers. At Shechem, then, Abraham bought a sepulcher in the general necropolis, for which he took the customary receipt in the form of an inscribed cuneiform clay tablet, the like of which we found in the area of the temple of El-berith. Abraham's constant and long use of this burying place settled his claim to it. The cuneiform tablet testifying to its purchase passed from the hand of Abraham to that of Isaac, among other Abrahamic records. When Jacob settled at Shechem he naturally claimed this family sepulture right, possibly sending to his father Isaac, at Beersheba, for the indenture. The necropolis immediately adjoined the demesne of Jacob, as indicated by the site of Jacob's well, which explains the reference in Joshua 24:23.

But the objection is urged that Abraham is represented as purchasing this sepulcher from "Hamor, the father of Shechem"; while Jacob, one hundred and fifty to seventy-five years later, is declared to have acquired

"a parcel of a field" in Shechem from "Hamor, Shechem's father." Critics have generally considered the two statements on their face to be contradictory; but they are not; rather they are confirmatory. "Hamor," which means "a he ass," and, hence, "the chief burden bearer," was evidently the title of the patriarch, or ruler, of Shechem, just as "Pharaoh" was the title of the king of Egypt, while "Shechem" was the common designation of the heir apparent of the ruling house, as the eldest son of the English royal house is known as the Prince of Wales. That there should have been a "Hamor" in the time of Abraham and another in the time of Jacob offers no more difficulty than that there was a "Pharaoh" in the time of Abraham and another in the time of his grandson.² A similar situation is presented in the cases of Abraham and Isaac in connection with Abimelech the King of Gerar and his military minister, Phichol. Some critics have held that these two stories represent a confusion of the text, or else an ignorant repetition of the story as told concerning Abraham. This is a gratuity. *Abimelech* means "the father king," and so was an inherited title; while *Phichol* signifies "the common mouth," and so became the hereditary title of the prime minister, like vizier, "the common eye."

It seems certain, therefore, from the statement of Stephen, that the bodies of all the eleven brethren of Joseph were embalmed in Egypt, carried over into Shechem, and there interred in the family tomb. After nearly four hundred years the mummy of Joseph was given to the common repose. The research at Shechem has approached to the point of the proof of these con-

² Five hundred and thirty years later, in the Israelitish era, the Israelitish patriarch, or elder, of Shechem was referred to as "Hamor, the father of Shechem" (Judges 9:28).

clusions. A day of fuller attestation, with new illuminations of patriarchal history, awaits the parting of the veil of nearly forty centuries of silence.

In closing this paper, it seems pertinent to add a few words to the well supported estimates of the numbers constituting the feudal households of Abraham and Jacob. Evidently the Abrahamic establishment did not suffer in size or importance after it passed to the hands of Isaac, for we hear of a prince, who is rated as a king, saying to him that his state and substance were "much mightier" than his own (Gen. 26:16). When Jacob and his people added themselves to the settlement of his father at Hebron there should have been present in the community an aggregate of five thousand souls. The account of the removal of Jacob into Egypt shows that his immediate family consisted of seventy persons. It is but logical to suppose that a sufficient number of servants went with his herds to tend and safeguard them in the journey and to keep them after their arrival in Egypt, but it does not appear that such bands attended him thither as followed him out of Padan-aram.

What was the after history of those retainers of the Isaac-Jacob camp left in Palestine? The answer may make one of the most interesting stories connected with the early history of the land of promise. It is strictly an explication of archeology. Bible scholars and archeologists for a long time have been aware of the fact that the Hebrew language was spoken to some extent in Palestine during the four hundred years of the Israelitish bondage in Egypt. The Tel-el-Amarna tablets show that writing in Hebrew was not unknown there during this period. Also these tablets contain references to a mysterious and militant people in the land, described as *Habiri*. This name, found only on the

monuments, is generally accepted as being a form for Hebrew. So nearly have the Habiri and the Hebrews been identified that some critics have concluded that the tablet references to the former point to the invasion by Joshua. Finding chronological difficulties here, others have sought to show that there were two Hebrew invasions of Palestine, the first in the age preceding that of Joshua. But no such theory spinning is necessary to explain the fact involved. Amenophis IV, who reigned in Egypt sometime during the century and a half preceding the time of Moses, had inherited from his predecessors extensive territories in Palestine and other parts of the west land. These territories particularly included the fortress city of Jerusalem and the lands afterwards included in the inheritance of the tribe of Judah. At this time, Ebed-Hepa was governor of Jerusalem. Several of the Tel-el-Amarna letters are from his hand to Pharaoh Amenophis, telling of the depredations of the Habiri on the king's holdings of Gezer, Gath, Keilah, Beth-shemesh, Lacish, and other cities in the circle of the left-over Syrians of Jacob at Beersheba. The Jabbok-Shechem vision and ideals of Jacob remained strong in the consciousness of these near Israelites, and they were attempting to assert a hereditary ownership of the land.

But another and even more suggestive sequence comes of this view of the left-over camp of Jacob in the hinterland of Beersheba. It now seems possible that the Kenites, a people which played an interesting and romantic part in the conquest of the lands allotted to the tribe of Judah, may have been identified with the Habiri, and also with the community left behind by Jacob. Efforts have been made to classify the Kenites as a tribal contingent of either the Midianites or the

Amalekites, but their affinity with Israel is much more apparent and will quite fit into the conclusion that, during the four hundred years of Israel's bondage, the several thousand ex-retainers of Jacob multiplied into a strong and warlike people, and not only retained the Beersheba hinterland and its northward contiguities, but also pushed southward into Kadesh and the interior of the Sinaitic Peninsula. During this period the descendants of Lot became the kingdom of Edom, while those of Esau likewise multiplied into a nation.

Jethro, the priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, whose offspring was incorporated in the tribe of Judah (Judges 1:16), was a Kenite; and it is conceivable that the monotheistic shrine at which he ministered in Midian was the survival of the altar of *El-elohe-Israel*, erected by Jacob at Shechem.³ It is also conceivable that this Jethro was in possession of the Abrahamic traditions, as contained in the early chapters of Genesis. It now seems that we should place the shrine of Jethro at Kadesh, in the northern circle of Midian, rather than so far southward as is usually indicated.

Dr. Sellin is authority for the suggestion, that in pre-Mosaic times a sanctuary existed at Kadesh, and

³ Since this article was put in type, I have received from the hand of Dr. Sellin the print, *Sonderabdruck aus der Zeitschrift Deutschen Palestina-Vereins. Jahrgang 1928 II*, which contains an account of excavation work done by him at Shechem from March 10 to April 12, 1928. This brief season, which was spent in pushing the uncovering eastward from the temple area of El-berith, was richly rewarded, two noteworthy stones being retrieved. One of these is of the distinct contour of a field altar. The other is pillar-like in form, consisting of two members, a base and a stele-like inset. The inset, which is 0.80 meters in height, appears to have been broken in half. Dr. Sellin does not hesitate to associate the first of these stones with the altar which Jacob erected to El-elohe-Israel (Gen. 33:20). The second should be the memorial stone set up by Joshua (Joshua 24:26), and beside which Abimelech was crowned king (Judges 9:6). If the El-elohe stone is identified, it will establish my contention that the early shrine of El-berith was monotheistic, and that both Abraham and Jacob worshiped within the precincts of the Amorite sanctuary. The yet uncovered treasures of Shechem are beyond computation.

that there are indications that Levites were priests of the same (Aftermath Series, p. 248). Very ancient calendarial records also are believed to have existed there. These, together with the fact of a local monotheistic worship, were, no doubt, the magnet that drew Moses to that august retreat. It is my confident expectation that these conclusions will be immensely strengthened by the final uncovering of Shechem.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

THE HARPER'S LAMENT

FROM THE TOMB OF NEFER-HETEPH, IN THE XVIII
DYNASTY OF EGYPT

By WILLIAM WALLACE MARTIN

THE ARTICLE, Primeval Montheism, by Bishop H. M. Du Bose, in THE BIBLICAL REVIEW of April, 1927, is a vital, challenging document. Few statements are more daring and truer than this sentence which I quote: "To draw a line of cultic darkness across the face of the world at about the tenth century before Christ, as the critics have done, is, in the view of the earlier record of Genesis, to admit, not so much the unreliability of Genesis, as the impotency of Bible science, so called, to deal with its own data and discoveries." Genesis records a mighty and prevalent faith in one God in those ancient times, not a later faith transported by a fraud-literature to those days.

The period of the XVIII dynasty (1550-1400 B.C.) was the golden age of Egypt. Wealth was quite unlimited. The kings gave employment to painters, architects, sculptors, engineers. Old temples were rebuilt; new temples rose up imposingly along the banks of the Nile. Granite obelisks, colossal statues, bas-reliefs, evidencing marvelous skill, were constructed. Their magnificent ruins are now towering above the miserable hut-houses which are found in the towns along the Theban Nile.

There was in that day in Egypt a great monotheistic faith. A record is to be found in this Harper's Lament. Stern's *Aegyptische Zeitschrift* (1873) has a transla-

tion. Subsequent translations differ but little from this early one; the one I give here is made by that eminent archeologist, E. A. Wallis Budge. I challenge this translation and set mine in a parallel column.

HARPER'S LAMENT
(Budge)

I

Saith the singer to the harp
Who is in the tomb of Osiris,
The divine Father of Amen,
Nefer-heteph triumphant; he
saith:

This mighty one resteth;
Right and true is the decree,
good,

What hath come into being
from bodies

Must pass before thee, O Ra.
The young men and women go
to their places.

Ra giveth himself at dawn,
Tmu setteth in Manu.

II

Men beget and women receive;
Every nose smelling the breath
of dawn,
And children and all alike,
Come to the place which be-
longeth to them.

III

Make a day happy, O divine
Father! O come.
Unguents and perfumes are
set before thee,
Mahu-flowers and lillies for
the arms, for the neck,
Of thy sister dwelling in thy
heart,
Sitting near thee. Come then.

THE HARPER'S LAMENT
(Martin)

I

Said the favorite of the harpers,
Who is in the sepulcher of Osiris
The loving God A the Unseen,
Nefer-Heteph the just; he said:

This chief is at rest.
Right was the decree, good.

What is begotten, in the body,

Passes at thy voice, O Ra.
All go to their places.
The sun is given each;
He begins with the dawn,
He ends when the setting is
In the west.

II

Man born of women is but a
moment;
Every nostril breathing the
breath of the morning,
Children, all alike, come
To the place prepared for them.

III

Make their day happy,
O loving God A,
Who come sitting before thee,
With unguents and perfumes
With flowers and lilies,
In their arms, on their necks,
Thy likeness, dwelling in thy
heart.
They sit before thee,

Song and music are before thee.	Coming with song and music before thee.
Set behind (thee) all evil things,	Set behind them all evil,
Think thou only upon gladness,	Let them think of gladness only,
Until that day cometh in which (a man) arriveth	Until the day comes
In the land (which) loveth silence.	When man remains in the land Which loveth silence.

The arrangement in both translations, both in lines and strophes, I am responsible for. The inscription is a prayer rather than a lament. I leave it with the reader to divine the meaning of the Budge translation. It abounds in strange vagaries, many having scarcely a meaning. If it has meaning, it is so bizarre that we are not enriched by the inscription when death is a subject upon which we meditate. The other translation gives a meditation which compares well with the finest of the Old Testament upon the brevity of life and the significance of the great unknown in the beyond. The expression, "The loving God A," was known to Moses. The classic passage in the Exodus, translated "I am That I am," should be translated, "I am Yah, who was A." Ael and Yah (or A) were the earliest names for the one God. Death is but a time of rest; the idea is familiar. The mortal obeys the call of Ra. Every one must pass to his place. The definition herein of life as a day is beautiful:

He begins with the dawn,
He ends when the setting is
In the west.

The day here is like the day in Genesis 1, not a twenty-four hour period, but any duration marked by two characteristics, a light-time, a time of darkness. Such was an ancient usage.

The second strophe is a characterization of our mortal life.

Man born of women is but a moment;
Every nostril breathing the breath of the morning,
Children, all alike, come
To the place prepared for them.

The Old Testament furnishes no parallel more beautiful.

The third strophe voices the prayer. The frieze of the Parthenon, where the maidens and others go in parade to the shrine of their god is no more vivid in the portrayal of a scene than this strophe portrays in words the going of the worshipers of the loving God A with unguents and perfumes, with flowers and lillies, that they might sit before Him. These worshipers bear the likeness, their dwelling is in the heart, of God. They come with music and songs. The prayer is, "Avert from these evil" until they enter into the realm where silence reigns.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

THE LONG HIDDEN TREASURES OF ELEPHANTINE ¹

By PARKE P. FLOURNOY

WHETHER the ancient Nubians and Egyptians believed that, at the First Cataract of the Nile, where their frontiers came together, there was a chain stretched across to restrain the annual overflow, with Chnub, (Greek, Anubis) the god of the Cataract, on the east, holding one end, and his wife, Sati, on the west, holding the other end, may be left to Egyptologists to decide.

Now, however, we know that a great dam has been stretched across to regulate the overflow, and also, that in the fifth century B.C., Chnub, the ram-headed god of the Cataract, was worshiped at Assuan, on the eastern shore, and Sati, at Elephantiné, across the channel. This last has been made plain by the remarkable papyri discovered within a few years past in the island which is so graphically described, in *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, by the distinguished traveler and archeologist, Amelia B. Edwards, as follows:

“The green isle of Elephantiné, which is about a mile in length, lies opposite Assuan, and divides the Nile into two channels. The Lybian and Arabian deserts—smooth amber sand-slopes on the one hand; ragged granite cliffs on the other—come down to the brink on either side. On the Lybian side a Sheyk’s tomb, on the Arabian shore, a bold fragment of Moorish architecture with ruined arches open to the sky, crown two opposing heights, and keep watch over the gate of

¹ All rights reserved.

the Cataract. Just under the Moorish ruin, and separated from the river by a slip of sandy beach, lies Assuan."

Just across the eastern channel of the Nile below the First Cataract, at which the line between Egypt and Nubia crosses it, on the southern end of the island of Elephantiné, was made the discovery of documents of great interest. Some of them were written before the time when Ezra and Nehemiah were leading the Jews back from the Captivity and rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, and some others during the generation following the work of these two remarkable men at the Holy City.

The traveler and archeologist from whose facile pen a quotation has been made above pictures to us the site of the discovery thus:

"It is a very beautiful island—rugged and lofty to the south; low and fertile to the north, with an exquisitely varied coast line full of wooded creeks and miniature beaches, in which one might expect at any moment to meet Robinson Crusoe with his goat-skin umbrella, or man Friday bending under a load of faggots. They are all Fridays here, however, for Elephantiné being the first Nubian outpost, is peopled by Nubians only. It contains two Nubian villages, and the mounds of a very ancient city which was the capital of all Egypt under the Pharaohs of the VI dynasty, between three and four thousand years before Christ."

"The lower part of the island, fringed with palm trees, is devoted to the cultivation of the castor-oil plant and other crops."

Miss Edwards also tells us of two royal palaces which in the days of the early dynasties, 2000-3000 B.C., occupied a part of the island; but she did not tell of the

fortress which stood on the southern promontory of the island, and its twin fortress at Assuan, in which garrisons were stationed to guard the frontier in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and, indeed, long before. For she could not know of this. The documents discovered on the spot have made this clear. Continuing, she tells us:

“We picked up several bits of inscribed terra cotta—evidently fragments of vases—and brought away some three or four as souvenirs of the place, and thought no more about them.

“We little dreamed that Dr. Birch, in his cheerless official room at the British Museum, was at this very time deciphering a collection of similar fragments, nearly all of which had been brought from this very spot.”

If she had even dreamed of what was concealed there, to be unearthed in the early days of the twentieth century, she would hardly have said of Elephantiné that,

“The ruined gateway of Alexander and the battered statue of Menephtah are the only objects of archeological interest in the island.”

Having no claims to being an archeologist, I will tell of these discoveries chiefly in the words of Professor Sayce, who has ably edited the documents discovered in 1904 at Elephantiné; in quotations from Professor Gunkel's account of the most interesting of all, discovered by Doctor Rubensohn in 1907; and in the words of the documents themselves, translated by A. E. Cowley and Mary Gurney.

Professor Sayce begins his Introduction to the folio containing the ten Aramaic documents put into his hands by Mr. Mond by referring to some less considerable discoveries at Elephantiné. An examination of this very learned work, in which Mr. A. E. Cowley did

the deciphering and translating of the Aramaic, and the documents which were photographed under the superintendence of Mr. Howard Carter, Inspector to the Service of Antiquities in Egypt, shows that no care was spared to make the most perfect presentation of these interesting finds. The documents as photographed are seen to be in clear, large script, inclining to cursive, and are probably as easy to read as the papyri themselves. As Professor Sayce tells us, there are no distinctive forms for final letters such as we have in our Hebrew Bibles, which represent manuscripts later than these papyri by at least fifteen centuries.

The folio of Professors Sayce and Cowley indicates in its title that the papyri were discovered at Assuan; but it seems quite certain that, as Professor Gunkel says, they were discovered at Elephantiné and were then carried across to Assuan for sale. Indeed, Professor Sayce says that they were assured that they had really been discovered in the island of Elephantiné, and that "the actual spot from which they had come was pointed out to us." Yet he doubted, as now appears, without reason. He continues:

"The find was such as had never been made before. The papyri were in practically perfect condition, the very strings which had been tied round them were intact, and the clay seals which fastened the strings to the papyri were unbroken.

"For the first time, the Aramaic scholar has at his disposal a series of connected and fairly lengthy documents, clearly written and but little injured, and furnished with exact dates."

The exactness of the dates is secured by the dating of these deeds and other business papers with the year of

the Persian sovereign, and the days of the Persian months and of the Egyptian also.

Some interesting and important facts concerning the conditions of Jewish life at Elephantiné appear in these papyri:

"There was no religious intolerance. The Jewish oath by Jahu was as valid in the courts of law as the oath by Sati." Sati was the Egyptian goddess of Elephantiné.

"The Jews had their own court—the tribunal of the Hebrews—which was recognized by the law quite as fully as any of the other courts of the country, Egyptian or Persian."

"The law under which the Jews of Elephantiné lived in common with their neighbors was that of Persia. Apart from 'the Tribunal of the Jews,' there is nothing to show that they were subject to any code of laws of their own or to local laws of Egypt. The conveyance of property is couched in the technical terms of Babylonian law, from which the law of Western Asia derived its origin, and the deeds which relate to it are drawn up in the form made familiar to us by the legal documents of Babylonia."

A Jew who owned property "could will it to whom he would, and determine the succession to it after his death."

In respect to the right to devise by will, the woman was on an equal footing with the man. She could hold property and leave it by will as she wished. "We learn that the woman had the same right as the man to pronounce a sentence of divorce; but in each case it was only valid if pronounced in a public 'assembly.'"

"The mixture of names in the deeds is of considerable interest." They were found to be Jewish, Egyp-

tian, Persian, Syrian, Babylonian, Berber, and perhaps others.

Professor Sayce tells us that a new light is thrown by these documents "on the history and character of the Aramaic language, as it was spoken and written in the Western provinces of the Persian empire in the V. century B.C.; new words and meanings are added to the Aramaic Dictionary, and new forms or idioms to Aramaic grammar, while the origin of the Biblical Chaldee is at length explained to us."

It may be added that while twenty-six, if not more of the persons mentioned in these deeds, bear Bible names, the documents discovered about three years later at Elephantiné introduce the names of persons mentioned in the Bible who were contemporaries of Ezra and Nehemiah, one of whom was still living when the papyri were written, while an appeal is made to the sons of another who had probably died. Sanballat, the chief enemy of Nehemiah and his people, is represented in the papyri by "the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria," and Johohanan, mentioned in Nehemiah 12:22-23, is appealed to as "Johohanan, the high priest at Jerusalem."

The discovery of this last roll of papyri was made by Dr. Rubensohn of the German expedition, in the same mounds on Elephantiné in 1907 where the ten already mentioned had been found in 1904. The clue as to the locality was gained by the finding of the Egyptian word for ivory, *jb*, on a long strip of papyrus published by Euting in 1903. The island was named *Jb* or *Jeb* (now Elephantiné) because it was formerly a depot for elephants' tusks brought from the more southerly regions of Africa. The island is called *Jeb* in the papyri.

Doctor Herman Gunkel, writing of this last dis-

covery by Rubensohn in 1907, in the *Deutsche-Randschau*, Berlin, and referring to the former discoveries, says:

"All this, however, is cast into the shade by the papyrus lately discovered by Doctor Rubensohn, and now placed in the Berlin Museum. . . . Two copies have been found, one incomplete. A third and fourth portion also refer to the same event. . . . All these papyri belong to the same period, as is shown by dates and names, and they explain one another."

The roll was taken to the Berlin Museum with the seals unbroken. A description of them is found in *The Expositor* for January, 1911, in Gunkel's article, translated by Mary Gurney. A few extracts from the papyri found in 1907, and described in this article will be in place. The very first words of the earliest temple document are not without significance:

To our lord Bagohi, ruler of Juda, thy servant Jedonja, with his colleagues, the priests in the fortress of Jeb.

Here we find the high priest of the temple, mentioned in the papyri first discovered, with assistant priests, appealing to the Persian governor of the province of Judea, Bagohi. Josephus mistakenly—as has long been thought, and is now proven by the papyri—placed Bagohi about seventy-five years after his real date, leading many critics to place Ezra and Nehemiah long after their time.

The papyrus, written in the seventeenth year of the reign of Darius II (424-405 B.C.), is addressed to Bagohi "the governor of Juda." Josephus represents Bagoas (*Antiquities*, XI: 7) as under Artaxerxes M., and Sanballat as "sent into Samaria" by "Darius, the last king of Persia." Sanballat is represented as the contemporary of Jaddua, the high priest who, Josephus

says, went out to meet Alexander the Great when he was approaching Jerusalem in 331 B.C. But Nehemiah mentions him in 446 B.C., 115 years earlier, and these papyri mention his sons in 408 B.C. The critics referred to preferred to follow Josephus rather than Nehemiah. Since the discovery of this papyrus the mistake of Josephus is made evident, and the period of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Sanballat is fixed with absolute certainty.

The occasion of the appeal to Bagohi was the destruction of their temple which had so long stood within the fortress on Elephantiné. Gunkel supposes that the Jews there were descendants of Jewish soldiers who had been stationed in the fortress as a garrison some centuries before this time. As will be seen the temple to Jahu (Jehovah) was erected before the advent of Cambyses, and some think the Jews were there even as early as the eighth century before Christ. At any rate the fathers and grandfathers and great grandfathers of these Jews had worshiped here since the erection of the temple of Chnub, the god of the Cataract, just across at Assuan (or Sewen, as it seems to have been called at the time the letters were written). The chief priest at Elephantiné, Jedonja, tells Bagohi a pitiful tale, for it seems that one Waidrang was bribed by the priests of Chnub to bring about the destruction of the Jews' time-honored temple:

"Thereupon, this cursed Waidrang sent a letter to his son, Nephajan, who was ruler of the fortress of Sewen, saying that the temple in the fortress of Jeb must be destroyed."

"Then Nephajan brought Egyptian and other troops and having weapons, entered the fortress of Jeb, pressed into the temple and razed it to the ground."

"They broke the stone pillars which were there; they also destroyed the five gateways hewn out of stone, which were in the temple, and the doors with bronze hinges, the roof entirely constructed of cedar beams and the remaining furniture they

burned with fire. The golden and silver vessels for sprinkling and the utensils of the temple they carried away and appropriated.

"In the days of the kings of Egypt our fathers had built this temple in the fortress of Jeb. When Cambyses conquered Egypt, he found this temple already built. He destroyed the temples of the gods of the Egyptians, but this temple was not injured."

Care is taken to state to the Persian official that Arsames, the Persian satrap of Egypt, was not to blame for the outrage, as he was absent from Egypt at the time. Jedonja continues:

"After the deeds of Waidrang and the priests of Chnub, we wore sackcloth, with our wives and children, and we fasted and prayed to Jahu, the Lord of Heaven."

It seems that immediately after the destruction of their temple in 411 B.C., Jedonja and his colleagues sent a letter to the high priest at Jerusalem. For, in now appealing to the Persian governor at Jerusalem, we find them saying:

"At the time this misfortune happened to us, we sent a writing to our lords and also to Jehohanan, the High Priest, with his colleagues, the priests of Jerusalem, to Ostan, the brother of Anani and to the nobles of the Jews; but they returned no letter to us."

He describes their grief:

"We have worn sackcloth and have fasted since Tammuz day of the 14th year of King Darius unto this day; our wives have become like widows; we have not anointed ourselves with oil, and we have drunk no wine. Also until this day of the 17th year of King Darius, no meal offering, no offering of frankincense or burnt offering has been brought to the temple."

"Thy servants now speak, Jehonja with his companions, and the Jews—all citizens of Jeb. If it appear right unto my lord, have regard to this temple to rebuild it."

"Behold us here in Egypt who have received thy benefits and favors. We pray thee to send a letter unto thy servants concerning the temple of the God Jahu, that it may be rebuilt in the fortress of Jeb as it was before. Then will we offer meal offerings. . . ."

"And with our wives and children . . . will pray for thee, if this be so [done] until the rebuilding of the temple." (See a similar promise in Ezra 6: 10.)

"All these things we have notified in our own letter to Delaja and Shelemja the sons of Sanballat the ruler of Samaria."

So we find the sons of Sanballat mentioned in this writing of November, 408 B.C., and also Jehohanan, the high priest of Jerusalem; and turning to the book of Nehemiah we find much about Sanballat himself, the enemy of the Jews and the opposer of Nehemiah. We also find (Neh. 12:11) Jehoiada, a high priest under Nehemiah's administration, and Jehohanan, his son, named as next after him in the line of high priests—evidently the same to whom this letter states that a letter had been written three years before, 411 B.C.

The appeal to Jehohanan, the high priest at Jerusalem, was not answered. This high priest's brother, Manasseh, had been driven from Jerusalem by Nehemiah because he had married the daughter of Sanballat, the enemy of the Jews (Neh. 13:28). He is credited with the building of the rival temple of the Samaritans, to whom he had gone, on Mt. Gerizim. It is not very strange, if this was so, that his brother Jehohanan and the leaders at Jerusalem were unwilling to assist in rebuilding a temple in Egypt which they would probably consider another rival place of worship. So, as we have seen, these priests at Elephantiné, after waiting three years, turned to the Gentiles for help. As Cyrus had ordered the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem and Darius had ordered the work, which had been arrested by the opposition of the neighboring Persian pashas, to be resumed and forwarded, when the decree of Cyrus was discovered in "the house of the rolls" at Ecbatana (Ezra 6), it was hoped that the Persian King

might be influenced by Bagoas to help in this extremity. They promise in return, it seems from the document, to pay (probably from revenues of the prospective rebuilt temple), over a million dollars in silver (a thousand talents of silver). It is added:

"As for the gold we have sent out message and communication. . . . All these things we have notified in our own letter to Delaja and Shelemja, the sons of Sanballat, the ruler of Samaria."

Professor Gunkel tells us of "a leaf, subsequently discovered," which he considers "a protocol on the reports of Bagohi and Delaja" (Sanballat's elder son) in which these remarkable words are found:

"It is for thee to command in Egypt, before Arsham, concerning the Altar-House of the God of Heaven, which was built in the fortress of Jeb, before our days and before Cambyses,² and afterwards destroyed by the accursed Waidrang in the fourteenth year of king Darius, that it be rebuilt in its own place, as it was before; meal offerings and frankincense to be again offered at the altar as in ancient days."

It will be noticed that burnt offerings are not mentioned here. The offering of rams, it is thought by Professor Gunkel, was not to be allowed, lest the anger of the worshipers of Chnub, the ram-headed god, should be again aroused.

To a layman in such matters it seems strange to find that, in this temple at Elephantiné, a company of priests under a chief priest had been accustomed to present in the worship of Jehovah sacrifices directed by the "Priest Code," which, many critics assure us, was promulgated by Ezra in 444 B.C.—a mode of worship which had evidently been practiced there before 526 B.C., when Cambyses conquered Egypt, eighty-two years earlier, and

² Cambyses invaded Egypt 526 B.C.

probably back to the time of Psammeticus I, the contemporary of King Josiah.

If Bagoas and Sanballat were legendary characters, as Winckler has asserted, it seems strange to find them mentioned as real persons here, and one of them and the son of the other earnestly appealed to for help. If Sanballat was governor of Samaria under "the last king of Persia" at the coming of Alexander the Great, in 331 B.C., as critics following Josephus hold, it seems strange to find two of his sons men of influence in 408 B.C., seventy-seven years before. If Nehemiah and Ezra flourished in the time of Artaxerxes II (d. 359), as some have lately contended, we are filled with wonder when we find the grandson of their contemporary, Elia-shib, appealed to as high priest in 441 B.C. by the Jews in Elephantiné. Grandsons do not usually precede their grandfathers. If new problems are raised by these discoveries, as some think, here are some that will be quite old when they are solved.

These papyri seem to settle several things which have been questioned:

1. That Ezra and Nehemiah lived at the time represented in the books bearing their names.
2. That the ritual of worship laid down in Leviticus was observed long before the time of Ezra, and therefore was not originated by him.
3. That, since the Aramaic of these documents shows that Aramaic documents quoted in Ezra, and the Aramaic passages in Daniel, do not indicate a later origin than that traditionally assigned these books, critics are forced to find other reasons for discrediting them.
4. That such characters as Sanballat and Jehohanan, mentioned in Nehemiah, and Bagoas, the Persian

governor, were not mythological, but real men, some living in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and some but little later.

The whole result is an impression of reality and truth in the portraiture of the times as given in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah; and it is hardly possible to believe these most single-hearted restorers of God's worship to have been either deceivers or deceived.

When we find Nehemiah humbly confessing, "We . . . have not kept the commandments, nor the statutes, nor the ordinances which *thou commandedst by thy servant Moses*" (Neh. 1:6-7) and when we find the Feast of Tabernacles kept with such faithfulness and joy, and read, "*For since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun*, unto that day had not the children of Israel done so," and when we find it stated that he (Ezra) day by day, from the first day unto the last day, read in the book of the "*law of God*," who can believe that this was all a solemn farce in which Ezra was foisting a forgery on a credulous people, with Nehemiah joining in the deception? And Nehemiah implies quite accurate knowledge of Jewish history "since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun," in speaking of a law that, though existing, was not observed during the long interval, showing us that the nonobservance of an ordinance is no proof of the nonexistence of a law commanding that it should be observed.

A letter to me from Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis,³ the discoverer of the Syriac Gospels in the Convent of St. Catharine at Mt. Sinai, lies before me as I write. She and her twin sister, Mrs. Gibson, were just about to leave their home, Castle Brae, Cambridge, England, to

³ This letter, dated March 7, 1912, was one among the last written me before her lamented death.

attend the Orientalist Congress, which was to meet in Athens, Greece. Great honors had come to Mrs. Lewis from English and Continental universities, in recognition of her remarkable scholarship and great discovery at Mt. Sinai. In this letter she shows her interest in the later discoveries in this little island where the Jewish temple had stood "from the days of the Egyptian kings," and was not disturbed by Cambyses, son of Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon, in 538 B.C., and who, in his turn, became the conqueror of Egypt a decade after his father's death, as this papyrus letter tells Bagoas, the Persian satrap, and "Jehohanan, the High Priest in Jerusalem."

The pleas, first, of Nehemiah the cupbearer of the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus (465-425), and, second, of the chief priest of the temple of Jehovah on the island in the Nile to Bagoas, the representative of Darius II (424-405) in Judea, are both felt to be very real and impressive, and certainly historical. For now we have not ordinary historical records, written after events of which the historian had learned and liable to inaccuracy, but the very words of the actors themselves, written *at the time they occurred*.

Mrs. Lewis says, in the letter referred to:

"I enjoy these Congresses, because at them I have made valuable friends of scholars who are authorities in Biblical subjects. It really does good to bring them together.

"Some of them are greatly exercised about the Elephantiné papyri; and the followers of Wellhausen are evidently perturbed. A learned Assyriologist said to me the other day: 'They squirm.'"

It certainly looks as if they had reason to do so; for in this new light from Elephantiné they see their

“assured results” about the origin of the Old Testament suddenly found to have been mere guesses.

The “myths” of Winckler and many other scholars are shown to have been no myths, but men of flesh and blood, earnest, God-fearing men, and women too, with great griefs upon them for the loss of what was dearest to their souls, crying for help from the only human sources from which it would be likely to come.

Now these records, inscribed in Aramaic letters and language more than twenty-three centuries ago, contain earnest pleas to men who are not myths of some long past age, but contemporaries of the writers in the times following the return of the exiled Jews from the Babylonish captivity. It is not strange that critics who have regarded them as myths should be “exercised” and “perturbed” over these discoveries. For we read in Nehemiah (4:1-2): “But it came to pass that when Sanballat heard that we builded the wall, he was wroth and took great indignation and mocked the Jews. And he spake before his brethren and the army of Samaria and said, What do these feeble Jews,” etc. And we find that, here at Elephantiné, far back in Egyptian history the seat of empire and later the scene of the worship of Jehovah in the midst of idolators, when both Israel and Judah had become so largely idolatrous in the Holy Land, a letter has been written appealing to “Delaja and Shelemjah, the sons of Sanballat the ruler of Samaria.” A *daughter* of Sanballat also is mentioned in Nehemiah 13:28.

So in this papyrus letter, written thirty-six years after the time of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, we find at the same Samaria two sons and a daughter of the same Sanballat. To the mistaken critics they must appear as apparitions. It is not

strange that they were "exercised" about the discovery of the papyri. The "sons of Sanballat" were not the only apparitions to startle critics, but these are surely sufficient as links between the book of Nehemiah and these Aramaic records.

A full discussion of facts revealed in these Egyptian papyri may be found in the *Journal of Transactions of The Victoria Institute*, London (vol. LIII, p. 206 f.). For lack of space to include their testimony to the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, I must refer the reader to that. However, Dr. St. Clair Tisdall, probably the ablest and most thoroughly informed Orientalist in the world, in his lecture answered the critics who held that Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah used some Greek and Persian words; which indicated that these books were not written before the second century B.C. He took these words one by one, discussing each thoroughly, showing that this linguistic criticism had no weight at all. The Aramaic papyri found on the island of Elephantiné proved that these books could have been written in the fifth century B.C., their traditional date. These papyri were dated in different years of the reigns of the Persian kings of that century.

WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

WHATEVER THE TIMES, THERE ARE ALWAYS FOUND THOSE WHO think seriously upon what is said and done in the world, as the brief extracts here show. We may not always agree with these comments and interpretations, but they reflect the ideas of thoughtful men upon various subjects toward which we may well turn our attention:

"Pentecost adds nothing to the equipment of doctrines: it adds everything to the equipment of the teachers."—*J. Rendel Harris in Aaron's Breastplate.*

"God requires the preacher not to be popular, but to call out in His name, demanding of his people high and difficult things."—*John Andrew Holmes in The Christian Advocate.*

"The man who believes his beliefs and doubts his doubts is a stronger thinker than the man who doubts his beliefs and believes his doubts."—*Dr. John Timothy Stone in The Christian Observer.*

"The mystics are the pioneers, the leaders of mankind, in a great adventure, in the quest of God, in the exploration of the unmapped realms of Reality."—*Edmond Holmes in the Hibbert Journal.*

"You might as well tie roses on dead bushes and call this raising flowers as to talk about social service until you first get the people related to Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord."—*The United Presbyterian.*

"Let us ask ourselves, upon what ground would we believe that God is Love if we had not Jesus to turn to, if we had not for a supreme argument: Jesus, the crucified for Love's sake?"—*Albert D. Belden in The Expository Times.*

"The kind of religion that makes a man want to do something to free the world from its ignorance, its fears and super-

stitutions, to create living conditions which shall give every man his chance, is very much alive today.”—*The Christian Advocate*.

“It has been a constant experience of man in all ages that mere rationalism leaves him unsatisfied. Man craves in some sense or other of the word an enthusiasm that will lift him out of his merely rational self.”—*Professor Irving Babbitt*.

“However negative might be his own personal attitude toward Christianity, the undergraduate of twenty-five years ago entered the university with a very much greater experience of religion than his successor today.”—*Henry P. Van Dusen in The United Presbyterian*.

“Ecclesiasticism, whether in an individual or a group, always squirms under such a spotlight as that supplied, when necessary, by our present independent journals. We maintain that that kind of squirming is a wholesome exercise, whenever the spotlight is that of truth.”—*The Churchman*.

“What can be more, shall we say unfortunate, than to use words generally accepted as having a certain meaning and read into them new definitions of your own in order to avoid unpleasant consequences or to promote some new purpose.”—*Bernard Iddings Bell in The Saturday Review of Literature*.

“So the greatest test of faith comes to us when life shows its worst side, and it comes, I think, supremely in old age, when the whole temptation of life is to feed on memory instead of on hope. The greatest witness of faith is old age which has still the forward look.”—*S. M. Berry in The Crucible of Experience*.

“It is proverbially easier to destroy than to construct; and as a corollary of this proverb, it is easier for readers to apprehend the destructive than the constructive side of an author’s thought. More than this: when a writer is skillful at destructive criticism, the public is satisfied with that.”—*T. S. Eliot in The Forum*.

“With too facile tongue and pen it is asserted to-day that we preachers are as truly prophets for our generation as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel were for theirs, that all inspiration differs not in kind but in degree, that we are as essentially equipped to be spokesmen of God as these ancients were. Is that true?”—*R. C. Gillie in The Expository Times*.

“And surely this exuberance of floral beauty is not without

a meaning for the understanding heart. Is it not itself an exposition, as it were, a clear and conclusive demonstration, of the liberal love of God? That is exactly what it is. All this overflowing loveliness is a revelation of the bountifulness of the Providence that blesses us.”—*F. H. Dudden in The Delayed Victory.*

“The amateur still has a strangle hold on the leadership of American public affairs. The technical aristocracy of disciplined intelligence that is now coming out of its adolescence is functioning outside the channels of political life. But it is growing; the scope of its power covers a larger and larger area of American life every year.”—*Glenn Frank in The New York World.*

“‘But Jesus appeared and shewed unto them his wounds. Then they were glad.’ He was not yet, then, away beyond their reach, beyond a certain need of them. He had still—His wounds. There was something they could yet do: they could live in the world as those who have seen the unhealed wounds of the Saviour of the World.”—*John A. Hutton in There They Crucified Him.*

“Knowledge has its perils, but if we stick to Asbury’s motto and make prayer the ruling element of our lives, we shall uphold and increase our faith. I am more anxious about having in the ministry giants in prayer than about any other qualification.”—*Dr. T. Ferrier Hulme, fraternal delegate from the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*

“The spiritual life has a few great and commanding words. One of them is, *faith*. One of them is, *love*. One of them is, *peace*. These words have an astonishing power of survival. They survive the attacks of enemies, they survive the superficiality of friends, they survive that difficult experience of being passed from lip to lip until one would think they would be worn threadbare by constant use.”—*Lynn Harold Hough in The International Journal of Religious Education.*

“‘He appeared in another form.’ These are words to hush forever the foolish strife about modes of worship. There are those who look upon the eastern window of a cathedral, casting its glorious colours on altar-cloth and surplice and pavement, and say it stands for gross materialism. In their eyes the ritualist is an idolater. There are others who attend a meeting

in a Salvation Army barracks, and go away and talk irreverence. And they are all wrong."—*P. C. Ainsworth in A Thornless World.*

THE CAPACITY TO REACT FROM EXTREMES IS AMONG THE Creator's gifts to mankind. Lacking this a mad race would have long since destroyed itself. There are, true enough, reckless souls that never turn back from any headlong course, but humanity in the main is capable of a saving fear of going too far out of the way. Of course, as in the physical world, reaction itself may become extreme, but the disposition of human nature is, in the end, toward a safe mean. This general rule holds true to some extent in all realms of human life, and in none more so than in the religious.

For generations we have been cultivating the rational approach to all things, itself a reaction from the overcredulous times preceding. We are lost in the presence of anything that refuses to yield to keen scrutiny expressed in logical analysis. As Eucken has said: "Man acquires the proud consciousness of his own powers; the problems of the world's work crowd upon him, dazzle him, push far into the background all thought for the salvation of his soul."

Now, over against this comes a reviving interest in the mystical element in Christianity. Yet the term, mysticism, and its cognate forms are by many felt to mean something on the order of a pious occultism, and so the whole subject becomes an offense. But there is a religious experience and knowledge that transcends intellectual comprehension, and so far we seem to find no better adjective for its description than mystical. It is always a delight to find some sane, clear thinker with the gift of guiding us into a better understanding of such a subject, and we find in Professor J. G. McKenzie, of Paton College, Nottingham, England, one who helps us here. His commendable paper in *The British Weekly* upon *The Need for Mystical Religion* contains this illuminating and practical passage:

"What troubles me is not the difficulty of validating our religious experience, but the evident lack of the experience it-

self. Have we anything to validate? In a world realizing a progressive experience of God theology must always be a question rather than an answer, in the same way as philosophy is; but religion as an experience need not be a question; it can be a self-evidencing fact.

"It is for this reason that we need to turn our minds to a fresh study of mystical experience. A restatement of doctrine in modern terms cannot suffice to revitalise our churches or to reinspire man to seek eternal values in his personal life or in society. Fresh and spontaneous experience of God is needed; personal experience must be revived within our churches else we shall be attempting to justify doctrines which have no self-evidencing facts behind them. 'We need to rethink God,' said Glover; but surely the problem before us goes deeper. We need to re-experience God. Religion may continue to function as a social institution long after the vital experience which gave and sustained its life has exhausted itself. It then has a decorative function, it is embroidery, it can give no directive influence to social movements or social evolution. It then adds to the social spectacle, but not to its social life; it creates no social values. We must keep in mind that there is no such entity as social religion, no more than there is a social mind existing apart from individuals. Religion, as Whitehead has pointed out, is always solitary, individual, and always implies an individual experience of God; and it is by the solitary experiences of its members that the true Church is nourished, and in turn it is in nourishing the individual experience of its members that the Church finds its truly religious function. It is the experience of the Church rather than its body of doctrine she has to transmit. The experience of Christ rather than the interpretation of Him. It is the undercurrent of personal, vital experience of God which gives the Church what power she has—her foundation is mystical experience.

"Now the phrase 'mystical experience' is apt to be suspect. It is either associated with a religion of feeling or pathological symptoms. The feeling element is strong in religious experience because the feeling element is strong in every similar experience. My experience of the external world is ultimately sense experience. My experience of values in any sphere is ultimately a feeling experience, though the values themselves are objective. In the truly mystical experience, the experience on which the Church lives never ends in feeling. The function of all feeling is to re-enforce thought and action, indeed to gener-

ate them; and the immediate awareness of God, the intimate consciousness of God even in the great mystics of every type were followed by intense thought or action. Thought can originate no experience. It has a relating function. It relates one object to another, one idea to another. It is in feeling and willing that we are brought into intimate contact with the object. Although the mystic does not ascend to God on the logical steps of his reason, it does not follow that his experience and the object of it are not rational. We need to keep in mind that the mystical experience may be of all degrees, some reaching a more intense experience than others. But in this it differs not the least from other experiences. No two men experience the same degree of æsthetic feeling when held by the beauty of a sunset; why should we expect it in religion? Most writers when describing mysticism have the extreme type in view, and thus the real vital importance of mysticism is obscured. It must be open to all, for when the psychologist seeks to find the ultimate grounds on which the active workers in the Church base their belief in God and His revelation in Christ he finds it is always an experience of God. It is there I find the ultimate ground for my own belief. Indeed in analysing my own intellectual interests I find that they have been unconsciously motivated by two urges: to validate my experience of Christ and to deepen that experience."

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT THING IN RECENT THOUGHT IS ITS DISPOSITION to recognize more frankly, and even to emphasize, the fact that there is a vast range of truth beyond the grasp of the intellect. We do not, and cannot, come at all we know by our mental processes. The claims of spiritual certainty, without intellectual demonstration, are receiving ever more respectful consideration. If our exceedingly scientific age be a kind of revolt from the long centuries of credulity and superstition that preceded, it is in a fair way to produce a further reaction—may we hope in the direction of a more enlightened faith and a spiritually illumined reason?

Alfred Noyes has written on this line in *The Spectator*, London, and these passages are worth more than a passing glance:

"The fact is that in recent years, in every department of thought, we have been following a diminishing road which even-

tually runs out into nothingness. Science in direct defiance of its own first axiom has everywhere been explaining the greater by the less. Darwin's theory of evolution in almost every detail seems to be true as far as it goes, but it omits by far the greatest factor in the process. Some of the Anglican leaders who accept that theory seem to think that there is great virtue in the word 'gradual'; as if the productions of Beethoven or the works of Shakespeare out of the gaseous matter of which the planet was once composed were explained by the gradualness of the process. No theory of evolution has explained anything. At one end of the process we have a cloud of gas and at the other end Westminster Abbey with all that it implies, and we say that all this has grown up out of the action and reaction of the chemical elements in that original cloud of gas without any deeper power moving through and inspiring the process."

"The highest that we know here—indeed, the only reality of which we have immediate knowledge—is that of personality. Science claims that human personality is more and more controlling nature. Supreme personality, we may therefore suppose, would have supreme control in every detail. The Highest Reality of all, in which all the explanations reside, if the human intellect were capable of discovering them, can not be less than personal. We can not identify God with a universe in which nothing is self-sufficient, or its own explanation. Behind all these contingent shadow-shows we are driven at last by inexorable logic to that which is its own explanation, and is sufficient to itself and all that it has produced. When we ask what the attributes of that Being must be, we are forced to believe that they are above reason and beyond nature as it is known to science. What is this, after all, but the supernatural Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, of whom the Nicene Creed tells us, and whom St. Augustine found, not in the discourses of the Platonists, but in the voice of the Supreme Personality, infinite in perfection, speaking to what was highest in his own personality, and saying, 'Come unto me?'

"It is when science turns her face in this ascending direction that she wears the impassioned expression which is poetry, reflects in her face the glory of the divine center of the universe, and cries, with Pasteur, 'O salutaris hostia.'"

IT IS SOMETIMES JUST AS WELL TO BE REMINDED OF EVEN COMMONPLACE facts. The trouble is not that we don't have the right knowledge, but that we ignore or forget it. One of the

things we are forgetting now is the danger of a life that is becoming so regulated and standardized and conventionalized that we almost forget we have an individuality which calls for its own development. Our social nature rightly makes large demands upon us, but it is not the whole of us. The Lutheran in these words would remind us that each has a duty to himself and that personal happiness is not reached by making oneself part of a mass:

"This decade justly glories in the results that have been achieved by system and co-operation. The distinctive quality of our great modern inventions lies in the way they permit a multitude to divide and subdivide labor into processes where each individual has a place, and where all can contribute toward the quantitative making of needed products. Not only factories and cities, but also schools and societies are a means by which one person obtains the benefits of a mass of helpers.

"This manner of living tends to merge individuals into a sort of composite human being. Dependent as we are on others for food, raiment, employment, housing, government and social customs, we are not stimulated in the direction of self-initiative and self-valuation. We drift with the crowd. We do not use and thus develop the qualities of mind and heart that are our own specific endowments. We not only become creatures of habit, but we allow the groups with which we are associated to form our habits for us. We become 'standardized.'

"But personal happiness is not thus attained. Satisfaction and contentment cannot be made by intricate machinery nor can they be bestowed by a crowd of people. They must be produced by oneself. They are strictly individual qualities.

"We must therefore seek out, find and cultivate our particular resources. The exhortation credited to the Greek philosopher Plato, 'Know thyself,' needs a new and general emphasis. The Christian religion, however, is much more specific in its revelation of 'individual gifts' than any philosophy, ancient or modern. The early disciples learned how to distil happiness within themselves in the midst of circumstances far more difficult and uncomfortable than we meet today. No generation of Christians lacks similar examples."

THE DEMAND FOR INDIVIDUAL SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT IS COMING into its own again. It is even being admitted that it is the soil out of which must come the social conscience and mean-

for satisfactory social progress. In other words, the individual remains the unit of society, and to be effective he must have not only a character that is moral and rational, but a spiritual life that supplies the incentives to self-sacrifice and fulfilment of one's obligations to others. Lloyd C. Douglas, in *The Christian Century*, has put in this way the need of solitary experience of God:

"The church has gone through all manner of pious calisthenics before the altar, wept scalding tears, called itself humiliating names, fought for phrases in creeds and wallowed in gore to recapture banners with certain holy symbols embroidered on them. But it has been next to impossible to persuade the individual that he could assure himself of the reality of spiritual power only by the process of a solitary excursion into the confidence of God!

"That is still our chief difficulty. However fervently we sing together about our faith, we are not asking it to do the one thing for us which would transform our whole life, clear our minds of their foggiess, increase the radiance of our personalities, sanctify our friendships, heighten our appreciation of the beautiful in art and nature, enlarge our capacity for the transaction of legitimate business and emancipate us from the frightening phobias, the sallow pessimisms, the sighing timidities and the petty envies which undercut our peace, drain our neural resources and restrict our happiness.

"Jesus' outstanding contribution to our knowledge of divine energy was not unlike the discovery of the necessity for the insulation of electrical machinery. Neither Volta's battery nor Faraday's dynamo were of other than academic value until Du Fay insulated the current against contact with things which absorbed the power and dissipated it before it reached the object intended to be energized. Jesus counsels the candidate for spiritual power to insulate himself against contacts with 'things'; orders him to secrete himself in a closet and shut the door. Let him then approach God with a confidential message of the investments he has been making in the attempted rehabilitation of other people's lives—deeds kept so secret from the world that the applicant's own left hand has not been informed of the act."

THE CHIEF INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM FOR SEVERAL DECADES HAS been, how to increase production. The great economic prob-

lem now is, what to do with overproduction. The idea of efficiency, as applied to our temporal affairs, has been so overworked that even our educational system has been profoundly influenced by it—and the church has not escaped. The great object seems to be to make a greater record in the amount we accomplish this year than we did last—more goods made, greater sales, larger crops, more students graduated into already crowded professions, increase in the size of every institution, the church included. The character of the results is often overlooked, while the purpose of it all seems never to have been thought of.

The editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*, Henry Seidel Canby, in writing upon this present state of things has quite graphically outlined some of its more striking features. Here are some of his characteristic strokes in painting his picture of our idea of success:

“The great discovery of this century was that the barriers to success could be thrown down if you only knew enough. With more knowledge of agriculture the food supply could be readily increased. With a knowledge of credit wealth could be made to breed for many if not all. With a sounder comprehension of psychology man could be taught to use his brain properly instead of improperly. With a deeper knowledge of physics and chemistry our earthy environment could be changed from static to dynamic, space could be narrowed, time crowded with events, and labor given a leverage upon production.

“Books throughout this century show a growing obsession with the knowledge that could accomplish all these things. Plato, Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare look across the ages, but the typical twentieth century book is concerned with here and now.”

“Was there ever a civilization so little concerned with how to live? We preach of it, naturally, but in phrases often meaningless because they are drawn from books that express sets of ideas now archaic in practice. The university to-day is powerful beyond all comparison in teaching measurement—which is science—and weak beyond comparison in stirring more than faint queries as to what shall be done with success when we have it. Only a few rebels ask in terms that are really searching where our strenuous industrial developments lead, or what

Standard Oil or United States Steel can do for ultimate happiness. To question the relative value, say of preventative medicine, where no thought extends beyond the preservation of efficient workers able to run machines, seems absurd because it is completely outside our habit of mind. We are intoxicated by our success in controlling nature and energizing the brain. And what drunkard cared for the morrow!"

"I am not a medievalist (which is one of the diseases with which this era of knowledge is infecting our finer spirits), I am not even a rebel against this age, although I should welcome a few fanatics who could stir up thinking. Culture, as is evident, has always developed by the trial and error method, which means an overemphasis upon successful experiments. Scientists so long as they remained philosophers never learned to measure with that inhuman concentration upon mere things which has given them their present success. Democracy would never have got so far along the road if good minds had not set themselves the task of distributing the knowledge that enabled the peasant to use his mind as a tool. If we are all to live together in Babylonian movie palaces, which seems to be the collective ideal of the nineteen twenties, the magical secrets of how to succeed in business, how to express the personality in clothes, how to seem educated, and even civilized, with the minimum of energy diverted from money making, must be made accessible. A society based upon credit and supported by a neck and neck race between production and consumption must be informed as to the terms of its subsistence. For society must certainly stay alive, whether it knows how to live or not."

ONE OF THE PRICES OF OUR MODERN COMPLEX SOCIAL LIFE IS THE production of mediocre personalities. We are conventionalized in everything we are and do, from our clothing to our academic degrees. Any tendency to develop independent personality is frowned upon, rebuked, if possible quenched. One of the things that favor the young man coming from the farm to make his way in the city is that he has to a great extent escaped this. He has not been so continually kept in the milling process of contacts with great numbers of conventional associates that his native points and cutting edges are worn smooth.

This condition of our times in part accounts for the lack of great, commanding personalities in all fields. They are

spoiled in the making. Some such thought was lately expressed by Georges Clemenceau, the famous ex-Premier of France, nicknamed the "Tiger." Interviewed by Constantin Colas, who reports his ideas in *Personality*, the old statesman made a striking observation upon this matter of being oneself. The question of Colas and the answer it called forth reveal the nature of Clemenceau's own independent spirit:

"'In all France,' I told him, 'I'm sure you haven't one real enemy. You are yourself; you are provocative, and people like to argue with you out of sheer intellectual sportsmanship, but if any real harm came to you the heart of the Republic would be broken.'

"'To be one's self,' he went on, as though taking no note of my remark, 'is at once the worst and best thing in life, according to whether one wants to be a fool and have happiness based on ignorance, or an intellectual and have unrest based on understanding. How few people are their own selves! How few of their thoughts are really theirs! They heard them at tea yesterday, the theater the day before, or read them in a book where the author did their thinking for them. Their views are somebody else's, and all that fills their heads is borrowed plunder. They are afraid to give their individualities a chance to grow, for they know it's the road to Calvary. Every great personage was himself to the last syllable. The first requisite to greatness is to be one's self. Enemies are the interest one draws on greatness, and every time a man does a great act, he makes an enemy. Popularity is the privilege of mediocrities.'"

WHEN THE GREAT WAR HAD COME TO AN END MEN ASSUMED that the world would turn to its regular affairs and continue as it was before. Few seemed to comprehend that the war had unsettled, rather than settled, many things, and that it had accelerated a revolutionary change that had been steadily developing under modern conditions for a long period. The broad intelligence of recent times, the increasing spirit of tolerance of all opinion, the development of transportation and communication—many running to and fro and knowledge increasing—have combined to give us a changed world and a changing society. Mankind is ceasing to be provincial.

Naturally students of human affairs in the large have been closely watching all these things, and we are by way of developing a class of thinkers who deal with the world as a whole much as some historian might deal with Greece or Rome or England as his specialty. The Forum has been publishing some papers by a writer of this type, Salvador de Madariaga, a Spaniard. That monthly speaks of him as launching "his wit against the absurdities of our overplayed Age of Nationalism, calling for the next act—the Age of World-consciousness." A few paragraphs reveal his style and his concisely stated view of the present state of affairs:

"Were Christianity a deeper factor in our spiritual life than it really is, we should feel thankful for the distinction which the Deity has granted our generation. We are being tried. We are living times without peace because times brimful with hope. The civilization of the nineteenth century burst in 1914, like a gigantic pestiferous bubble. We have not yet erected the structure of the twentieth. We do not even know whether we shall have time to erect it during the paltry three quarters which remain. Peradventure we twentieth century men are meant to live a roofless life in the political wilderness, as the pioneers of the more fortunate twenty-first. But we need not complain. The wilderness is fascinating to watch, and over our heads the grays and mauves of bygone regrets mix their colors with the tender pinks of our newest hopes."

"The main world event in the twentieth century is the birth of the world. The world did not exist before. There were empires, nations, continents, seas, 'zones' (either of influence or of exploitation); there were open doors, and God only knows how drafty they made the earth. But no one knew the world. The world was born in the World War, which, as its name shows, was a world event. And now all men of sense realize that the world once born is going to grow. It is going to claim a right to its own history, its own economics, and its peace.

"But—and that is what makes our age so fascinating—the nations and the empires are not quite sure that the world is born, and even when they admit it to themselves, they are not quite happy about it. In fact, they are not happy at all. They wish the world was not there; they consider it a nuisance and they try to go on as they did in the good old days—each its own way, the way of anarchy and freedom.

"But there it is. The problem is very much the same as that which our cities have had to solve with signals and policemen in order to regulate traffic. When traffic down Broadway consisted of twenty broughams and a few herds of cows a day, no signals and no policemen were necessary. When the world was big and nations small and far between, no order was necessary in international affairs. Now the world has become small and nations and empires are enormous. Freedom of movement on the part of every one of them is impossible, for they are bound to keep bumping badly against each other in the narrow passages; and when nations bump there is always a danger of a serious spill."

SPECIALIZATION HAS BECOME A NECESSITY IN OUR HIGHLY ORGANIZED society. We would hardly consult a physician who was also known as a shrewd merchant and a quite successful lawyer. Not only so, but we would hardly employ a general practitioner in medicine if we required a critical operation upon the eye. Refined specializing has its place, in certain vocations at least, but is not to be recommended in religion. It limits the power and effect of the minister who confines himself to particular fields of thought, while the one who specializes upon particular classes of hearers makes his religion look narrow and works against true union of men in Christ. As Dr. Clarence A. Barbour has put it in a sermon published in *The Watchman-Examiner*:

"Some preachers are noted as preachers to the multitude, some as preachers to the select and educated. He is the best preacher who preaches the principles of the everlasting gospel, the universal teaching of Christ, to old and young, to rich and poor, to educated and uneducated alike; for the things which separate men are comparatively trifling after all; the things they share are great. It is by preaching of this kind that the union of Christians must be realized. It is by continually magnifying the peculiarities of our beliefs and practises that we are separated and kept from one another. Any real unity, even in the matter of the united furthering of great causes for the advancement of the kingdom of God in the world, becomes weak and powerless by reason of the over-magnifying of peculiarities. If we love more, if we believe with a warmer faith the great cen-

tral things of the gospel, these will draw us closer to each other, as they draw us more closely to themselves."

WHY IS THE EXTREMIST WITH US? WELL, SOME PEOPLE ARE constitutionally inclined that way. Without discrimination and moderation, they not only lack a sense of proportion, but they cannot abide those who do not accept their opinions down to the last item. But there are other extremists, those tempted to unwise and even unrighteous words and acts because they see truth ignored or attacked. We may sympathize with their views while we cannot approve their methods.

All such are positive extremists, vigorous, if sometimes vicious, advocates of definite ideas. But they are often provoked to action by the very opposite type—the negative extremist. Their attitude is unbelief and denial, the undoing of the faith of others as well as their own. Yet they usually make some claim to the name of believers. It is a species of treachery, than which few things more quickly kindle the wrath of loyal souls, judicious or otherwise. Chicago furnishes an instance which is mentioned, not because the situation there is exceptional, but because the facts have been studied and put in concise form. Professor George K. Betts, of the religious education department of Northwestern University, sent to Chicago ministers a questionnaire containing forty-seven questions concerning their religious views. In commenting upon the answers *The Literary Digest* remarks that, "The only thing that 436 Chicago ministers of various denominations agree upon so far as belief is concerned is that God exists." It also quotes this summary of the results of this survey, as given by *The Christian Century*:

"Twenty per cent. doubt or deny that God exists in three distinct persons; 13 per cent. that He is omnipotent; 32 per cent. that He occasionally sets aside law and performs a miracle; 44 per cent. that in Bible times God manifested Himself in a manner which no longer occurs; 33 per cent. that the Old Testament prophets were inspired to predict future events. A comparison of these last two items yields the curious result that at least 11 per cent. must believe that the power of pre-

dicting future events is still conferred upon men from time to time, or else that many individuals were careless in making their answers. Thirty per cent. doubt whether the inspiration of the Bible is different from that of other great religious literature. Sixty-six per cent. doubt or deny the equal authority of all parts of the Bible, and only 38 per cent. are sure that it is free from myth or legend. Twenty-nine per cent. doubt the Virgin Birth of Jesus, 8 per cent. His sinlessness, 16 per cent. His bodily resurrection. Only 3 per cent. doubt the continuance of life after death, but 38 per cent. the bodily resurrection. Only 58 per cent. are sure that a person's eternal state is fixed by his spiritual condition at the time of his death. Rather surprisingly, 60 per cent. say that they believe in a personal devil, 53 per cent. in hell as an actual place, and 57 per cent. in heaven as having a definite location somewhere in the universe."

ONE'S PERSONALITY—THE RESULTANT OF HIS HEREDITARY strains, his individual temperament, his health, his environment, his occupation, and so on—has a dominating influence on his outlook upon life. Many of us are convinced that we do this or that from a certain motive, when quite another prompts the deed. A man may give a generous sum to a cause under the impression that he is making a sacrifice, because he feels it his duty, when in truth he is more conscious of the praise of his fellows than of anything else, and the desire for this really determines the gift.

So with controversy. Some people feel that they are to be credited with both courage and self-sacrifice in the progress of the Kingdom because they dwell in a state of perpetual controversy, failing to realize that they have morbidly combative natures and that the cause would be benefited many times by their complete silence rather than by any argument. In speaking of *The High Cost of The Controversial Spirit*, *The Presbyterian Advance* says:

"Controversy, of course, has its inevitable place in the life of the church. Christian history is in no small part a record of controversy. In his chapter on 'Christ as a Controversialist,' in 'Imago Christi,' Dr. Stalker says that were he to present in full the appropriate scriptural references 'the bulkiest of all these bodies of evidence would have been the appendix to the

present chapter.' Out of the friction of conflicting minds have come progress and clearer vision of the truth. In all the centuries, the Christian has had to defend the faith—the best of all his defences being a life that demonstrates its truth.

"Controversy, however, must be distinguished sharply from the display and cultivation of a bitter, contentious spirit. The latter works harm, not good, especially when, as was true of the disciples, differences find their root in a desire for self-exaltation. There is a difference between controversy and the controversial spirit—between the Christian soldier and the ecclesiastical scavenger ever busy with his muck rake. At times wise men will fight, but wise men do not like to fight. 'Controversy,' to quote Dr. Stalker again, 'has fallen to a large extent into the hands of inferior practitioners.' And the cost of their persistent activities only the records of eternity will fully reveal.

"Part of the loss is in a sense of proportion. Minor issues become major, and major issues are lost to view. Phrases are elevated to the place of facts, and group 'labels' crowd out distinctions of character. The impression made upon the world by the bitter bickering of the disciples of the loving Christ is forgotten, but the bickering of today has a most harmful effect. 'These men,' said a lay visitor to a militant presbytery, 'should sit in high chairs and wear bibs.' 'If this is Christianity,' said another, 'I am through.' When one thinks of the throbbing world needs to which the church appeals, and of the restless search of great multitudes of men and women in our time for some gospel that has in it the ring of reality, such confusion of values is surely a tragic thing."

ON SOME POINTS THE CHURCH SEEMS TO BE SUFFERING FROM AN uneasy conscience. It is to be hoped that this will continue till it brings forth fruits meet for repentance. There are some evils that many leaders cry aloud against, and there are many evils that many leaders should cry aloud against—but do not. It may not be the church's place to enter corporately and aggressively into certain fields, as business and politics, but it is the church's place to denounce unrighteousness therein. In speaking editorially on this line *Zion's Herald* closes with these sentences:

"A fashionable church is no church of Christ. A popular preacher should go home and read his Bible. A church of

which all men speak well should go into executive session, and consider its evil ways, if perchance, through taking much thought on its ways, it may discover how it can regain the distinctive possession of the first Christian churches—unpopularity.

“We Protestants are well organized. We have buildings, raise budgets, support many officers and offices. We spend much money, we have world-embracing plans. Many of the plans are good. We send good missionaries to many lands. We build great schools. We do all manner of worthy things. But at what price? Is it the price of silence on glaring industrial injustice, silence on racial bigotry, silence on questions of international right? Not always. We have men who speak out. We have churches that dare. But what of our drives for funds, what of our denominational programs, what of our official spokesmen?

“Is the picture a gloomy one? Is the dream hopeless? Is the cross a pretty ornament, or a symbol of valiant willingness to suffer scorn? That remains to be seen. We shall know as the church dares to take up the leadership that it has laid down, and to occupy the advanced positions of social concern.”

RESPECTABILITY IS DANGEROUS WHEN IT IS OF THE WORLDLY kind and is applied to the church. The very people who most need all that the church stands for are the ones the world most persistently shuns. The world is ever a shrewd and unfeeling bargainer; she smiles upon those who have something to give in return for her favors; she is fond of being included in the reflected light of honor, power, fame, social position, and whatever else can add to her own well-being and complacency; and the possession of wealth she regards as meaning most or all of these. All this sort of advantage spells respectability, but it is the kind of respectability the church cannot afford, when it is purchased at the price of her great mission. Dr. J. H. Riddell, in writing a cautionary word, in *The New Outlook*, to the United Church of Canada, gives this earnest reminder, which is needed by many other churches than the great body here mentioned:

“But what of the thousands of our brothers and sisters who are the slaves of appetite, lust and passion, who are stained by

gross indulgence, scarred by nights of sensual revelry and blackened by the grimy touch of vile companions. Consequently they are unattractive, unappealing and unpromising. They hold out little hope to the casual observer, and the theorist. But there is One who loves them however degraded they are, longs for their return and gave His Son for their salvation. If our Church would fulfil our Lord's command she must not draw away from the haunts of these sin-burdened souls, from areas which they frequent, and thus leave them alone to become more and more the slaves of their own growing passions.

"Because these people need a message which will bring relief to their souls and because the Church alone has the only message which will secure relief, and because it is our Lord's command to carry the message, our Church must assume with her other work the task of going down into these sin-stricken centres with the Gospel of hope and salvation with the glorious message of a fresh start, a new life and a complete mastery over sin through the grace of God by faith in Jesus Christ."

THE WORLD WATCHES AMERICA IN MORE THAN ONE WAY. It regards the United States as still largely a political experiment, which it watches with interest; it is studying the results of our industrial progress; it is considering our educational development; and it is contemplating our religion, its power over our lives and its spiritual and moral worth. As Stanley High has said in an address:

"Right now the intelligent men and women of the non-white world are sitting around on the rim of the Christian West. They have their eyes on us. They are discovering from our activity whether or not this Christian faith is workable. In the end we need to realize that the job of building a Christian world is a Main Street business. It extends to the farthest people across the farthest sea, but fundamentally it begins at home."

IT IS SOMETHING OF A PARADOX THAT, WHILE THERE IS SO MUCH criticism of the church, so insistent a charge that it has failed or is failing, the church never had so many members and so many organizations to accomplish its work. Where is the trouble? It seems to lie in the church's complacent attitude toward things in general. It almost seems as though it had

adopted the easy motto, "Live and let live." There needs to be a revival of the sacrificial, the heroic, the crusading spirit. It is in line with this thought that the International Mission Council at Jerusalem closed its message with this appeal:

"We are persuaded that we and all Christian people must seek a more heroic practice of the gospel. It cannot be that our present complacency and moderation are a faithful expression of the mind of Christ and of the meaning of his cross in the midst of the wrong and want of sin of our modern world. As we contemplate the work which Christ has laid upon his church, we who are met here on the Mount of Olives, in sight of Calvary, would take up for ourselves and summon those from whom we come, and to whom we return, to take up with us the cross of Christ, and all that for which it stands, and to go forth into the world to live in the fellowship of his sufferings and by the power of his resurrection."

THE SOWING OF SEED REQUIRES A COMBINATION OF CERTAIN FINE virtues—faith, hope, patience, industry. This is one of the things that adds beauty to the parable of the sower. It is also one of the things that ennobles the lives of those figuratively referred to in that vivid word picture. It seems a dreary and thankless task to preach and do the work of the ministry year after year in a spiritually arid region. Yet, if one is satisfied that it is his duty to do just that and to do it just there, in due time he shall reap if he faint not. Here is a fine instance, taken from *The Presbyterian*, showing the result of faithful sowing, even after hope had almost failed:

"A most fascinating story comes to us from Galilee. At Shefamer, an evangelical mission has attempted for years to win men to Christ and with small results. With little outside direction or inspiration, this group of Christians has met Sabbath after Sabbath for its regular hour of worship. Recently, representatives from perhaps forty Moslem families have been attending the services, and in October, on the last Sabbath morning, there waited outside the church a group of thirty men to say to the deacon that they wished to become Christians.

"The Moslem population of Galilee has been deeply stirred by this break in their ranks. For more than fifty years brave, sacrificing missionaries had labored at Shefamer, and only last

year the remaining one left to care for other more hopeful fields. When they withdrew, it looked as if they all failed, and they probably confessed as much to their own hearts. Now there follows this glorious sequel, the influence of which will stir the whole of Galilee. Already from another village the news comes of sixteen others who wish to become Christians. Years ago, a missionary was sent home as an invalid from Shefamer, and since then a continuous ministry of prayer has ascended on behalf of this Galilean mission. And there is a promise of God that makes answers a certainty."

IT IS A HIGH ATTAINMENT TO MAKE USE OF ADVERSITY FOR spiritual development. At least we all talk that way, but our habit is to devise every possible means of escaping trouble and to seek to nurture our souls by strictly religious thoughts and to exercise them by good works.

It is a fact of Christian history, that newly made Christians, as individuals and as groups, have remarkable staying powers under affliction, and furthermore have the gift of extracting strength from their trials to a surprising degree. Dr. Cheng Ching Yi, the moderator of "the new uniting Christian Church of China," has this view of his church's relation to her enemies, according to a statement of his given in *The Congregationalist*:

"In general, the attitude of the Chinese Church at large is somewhat as follows: Toward those who oppose her with unreasoning blindness and sheer prejudice, she maintains a silent and patient forbearance; to those who attack her because of misunderstanding, she seeks to explain her position and remove the misunderstanding; such charges against organized Christianity as are well-founded and true, she frankly admits and sets about to remove by effecting the necessary change and improvement. In short, the Chinese Christian Church looks upon the anti-Christian movement as a health-giving and corrective influence to be used for the perfection of her life. She regards, therefore, some of the anti-Christian leaders not as her enemies but as her friends."

WHAT ARE THE REAL PURPOSES OF THE CHURCH SCHOOL—A better name than Sunday School? We are so deeply immersed

in methods today that we sometimes overlook purposes, or even forget there are any. If one has a deep impression of the vital importance of a great purpose, so that it supplies him with a great motive, the method will follow, if he has average intelligence and determination. But about the church school—is not its chief concern with the souls of the children and youth? To make a real Christian is to furnish the world with a citizen who will be concerned with civic righteousness and social service and all the rest. In an article in *Zion's Herald*, Carl Knudsen points out, in these two quotations, something of the world's need and the way to meet it:

“Making a better world at the present time means grappling with concrete issues in such a way that ordinary honesty, humanity, and Golden Rule attitudes toward other groups shall be as compelling to the conscience as the commandments regarding stealing, murdering, and covetousness with reference to individual conduct. Is there a manufacturer in our congregation who pays \$16.50 a week for common labor because ‘there are forty men waiting for every job’? Is it his policy to discharge married employees who have worked as long as ten years, because he can secure single employees to work for less? Then, under God, we have orders from the Holy Spirit to make him tremble in his pew! Our church school graduate should have a conception of the gospel which puts everything under the microscopic and telescopic test of the spirit of Jesus.”

“The third purpose of the church school is to make better men. Here we are introduced to the mystery of personality. Can you explain why Jesus could shift the line of march for all humanity and raise the worth of man to a unique place? You will answer in terms of awe and wonderment. You will say that religion puts a ‘light that never was, on sea or land,’ into the eye of man. You will say that the pearl of great price is yet cathedral-like souls. You will say that the soul literally palpitates for a greater measure of moral and spiritual attainment and that this intense desire means that there is an environment suited to the need. The migratory instinct of the bird points to a warmer and a brighter land. The spiritual nature of man points to spiritual reality.

“It is the work of the church school to graduate boys and girls who are intimately related to God. If we do any less, we

are merely teachers of ethics and of Bible history. The first qualification of a church school teacher is genuine spiritual personality. Religion may easily become one of the lost arts and degenerate into codified doctrines. This very tragedy befell the world in the long stretches of time between 600 A. D. and 1200 A. D. and in many shorter intervals later on. Bible history is necessary to provide *esprit de corps*. It is good to know that hundreds of Christian heroes have fought the good fight and won. But the original gospel of heroic enthusiasm for souls and for righteousness comes as a flame spreading from personality to personality. It is as invisible as molecules and microbes, but as real."

EVERY CALLING DEVELOPS ITS OWN PECULIAR VOCABULARY, IF only to a limited degree. The ministry is no exception, and its common weakness for the technical terminology of the classroom may, and often does, impair its effectiveness. This, with a leaning toward the oratorical style when the preacher is plainly not an orator, with many hearers prevents the understanding or application of a message in itself most acceptable. Speech can be dignified without having a profoundly learned sound. Nothing in the long run surpasses, for the audience of average intelligence, the clear conversational style of speech, consisting of terms that are familiar and forceful. The Congregationalist has expressed itself upon the subject in this sensible editorial:

"The *Journal of Education* described in a recent editorial how a schoolboy was regarded by his teacher as deficient because he could not add up a column of figures when directed. When the teacher asked a fellow student to help him, the supposedly deficient boy at once completed the addition because he understood the vernacular words which his friend used. The editorial then describes an experience which its writer had with a Japanese elevator operator who remained inactive when given the direction 'three flights.' He knew only the word *floor*.

"Does not the Christian message fail to reach the hearts and minds of people often because of a similar difficulty with language? Are the majority of pulpits entirely free of a dialect peculiar to themselves? Is it not amazing how few of the terms most commonly used in the pulpit suggest a definite meaning to the people in the pews? Of course, the use of words

depends upon the training and experience of those who listen, and one is compelled to use a certain number of technical words inseparably associated with the Church. A survey might well be conducted among ministers and laymen of various sections and types to ascertain more exactly the peculiarities of pulpit language and to give clear meanings to some terms whose import is now largely lost upon the average audience. Even speakers who popularize their addresses and who consciously attempt to simplify do not escape from the limitations of the pulpit dialect. It would be interesting to know just how many people in our churches habitually understand everything said from the pulpit."

THE GIFT FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING HAS ALWAYS BEEN REGARDED as most desirable and its cultivation as one of the finest arts. But, like other arts, its teachers and devotees differ more or less as to what is best. Moreover, standards change with time. Just now we are passing out of the era of the impassioned orator with his fine periods, his flowery figures of speech, and his agonizing appeals to the emotions. Modern, speech-sated audiences are little moved by these things. They are turning now to the speaker who gives a straightforward, clear presentation of his theme. They want a sermon or lecture or address of any sort that has a sharply defined message and holds to the business of delivering it, not without force, but without fuss.

Dr. William Lyon Phelps, professor of English literature at Yale for thirty-six years, belongs to this modern class, and this is one reason for the popularity he enjoys. Edward H. Cotton has given in *The Churchman* an interview with Dr. Phelps in which occurs this passage, commended to all public speakers, preachers included, with the reminder that simple and direct speech does not mean absence of sincerity, warmth or impressiveness:

"‘I seldom think how I am speaking,’ he said. ‘Studied gesture and particular tone of voice may do well enough for others, but I employ neither. I try to make what I say intimate. Unlike some speakers, I am always looking at the people in the audience. I talk directly to individuals. If someone appears listless, I speak to him until he gets interested and

looks up. Let's have sympathy with audiences; those persons have given us an hour of their time, often a valuable hour. We must not weary them with platitudes. Remember, they are there in the room, and can't get out. A lecturer who imposes on such good-nature and good will doesn't deserve a hearing. All of us have sat under men who immediately turned on the reading lamp, and discoursed from manuscript, in level, unmusical tones; and who read on and on for intolerable lengths, though the audience was continually getting more and more impatient and weary. I cannot understand the state of mind of such a speaker. I must feel a definite response. I should be just as conscious of a feeling of boredom as of a change of temperature. On more than one occasion I have gone onto the platform ill and tired, spoken an hour, and left the hall refreshed by the experience; the audience gave me something—what was it? Perhaps because I feel this sympathy, I almost never have the experience of inattentive listeners.' ”

PERHAPS MINISTERS AS A CLASS CANNOT GO ON A STRIKE, BUT they can and do protest against prevailing demands on the part of the church that prevent them from doing their distinctive work as spiritual leaders and shepherds. How can any man be a business manager, a general all round public speaker, a leader in civic enterprises, a lodge and club man, one to attend innumerable social functions, and, with all this, an able preacher of two or more fine sermons a week and a faithful pastor of some hundreds of people? Here is a quotation from a protest by James Brett Kenna, as condensed by *The Reader's Digest* from *Harper's Magazine*:

“Now the trouble is that I do not believe the value of a church to its people is tangible, and I find myself objecting more violently each year to having to substitute tangible assets for that intimate and intangible thing which Jesus called ‘abundant life.’ I grow increasingly sick of stirring up sentiment for social activities, choir robes, or the efforts of a girl in Singapore—and especially that cheapest of all tangibles, the effect of the church on property valuation.

“The worst of it is that I see no way to stop. The church is caught in the American habit of gauging success by the spectacular. A successful church, like a successful furniture

shop, is the one which has the biggest establishment, offers the biggest assortment of wares, and affords the biggest income.

"Is such a program likely to spread the message of One who said, 'Lay up your treasure in heaven' and 'The kingdom of heaven is within you'? Who among us has time to amass inner treasure? We are charged with the responsibility of a big organization, and the most we can do toward increasing the spiritual treasure of our parishes is to make our public addresses tend in that direction.

"Lack of time for study is not our only handicap. When we rise to deliver such addresses as we have managed to prepare, we face a group of people without a unified faith. A part of the audience is young, prides itself on knowing no theology, will not tolerate cant, and makes fine sport of emotionalism. Some of it is old and tolerant of nothing but the familiar old phraseology which has become invested with a supernatural power and sanctity. Upon our ability to attract the young people depends the future of the church; upon our ability to please and attract the loyalty of the middle-aged and old depends its present financial health. There we are, we who rise to preach the message of One who seemed able to tolerate every human weakness but hypocrisy. No wonder we try to be tactful, even though our critics call us hypocritics, or, if they know Mencknese, 'morons dealing out buncombe for the sake of a safe little job.' Few go back of the individual preacher, and let fly their satire at the situation itself."

IS IT DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO WRITE ANYTHING, FROM A LETTER to a learned book? Does just the right word elude you, or do the words, when you have them, refuse to combine into sentences as clear and flowing as you desire? Very well, you need not be discouraged on that account. Few men of deserved literary fame have escaped these same discouragements. Genius is a word greatly overworked. The finished product may win admiration and excite envy, as we marvel at the ability with which one expresses his thoughts on paper, but there have often been many hours or days of weary drudgery behind it. The public sees only results.

The Mentor has assembled a number of instances from the experiences of noted authors, and, for the greater encourage-

ment of all who write, we give several as selected by The Reader's Digest:

"Virgil devoted seven years to the building of one of his 'monuments,' his 'Georgics' comprising a little more than 2000 lines. Just words, yet destined to outlive the Pyramids.

"Lucretius gave a whole lifetime to a single poem. Then there is Thucydides, father of historical criticism. His masterpiece was 20 years in the making—a work that easily fits between two octavo-size covers!

"Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote: 'My manuscripts, blotted, scratched, interlined and scarcely legible, attest the trouble they cost me. Some of my periods I have turned and returned in my head for five or six nights before they were fit to be put on paper.'

"'You will read this treatise in a few hours,' Montesquieu, the celebrated jurist, told some friends on completing *The Spirit of Laws*, 'yet the labor expended on it has whitened my hair.' That his time and effort were not altogether ill spent is conjectured from the fact that many of the principles defined in the book had a powerful influence in the framing of the Constitution of the United States.

"Even Carlyle with all his experience found the task of putting together a manuscript extremely arduous. 'Certainly,' he once remarked, 'no one writes with the tremendous difficulty that I do. Shall I ever write with ease?'

"'He wrote with his heart's blood,' is the way his brother John expressed it. In time he sent his message forth in 34 volumes—a prodigious amount of work. Yet 'composition was a torture to him.'

"Rudyard Kipling rewrote his stories many times over, and then often made numerous corrections in the proof. Hall Caine made it a rule to revise every novel he wrote a dozen times. *The Raven* lay in Edgar Allan Poe's desk for ten years before he considered it fit to be published. Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding* was 18 years in the making. Plato spent weeks over a sentence, Charlotte Brontë hours over a word. Ruskin was never weary of polishing his jewellike phrases. Izaak Walton's simple, homely diction cost him incredible toil.

"Men of the most brilliant and imposing talents have lived a life of intense and incessant labor. Yet if any work be

markedly good it is the public's habit to attribute the author's success mainly to 'genius.'

"One definition of genius has been attributed to a dozen wise men: 'Genius is the capacity for taking infinite pains.'"

DESPITE EFFORTS TO DENY THE FACTS OR TO DISPARAGE THEIR seriousness, it is becoming clear that the principles of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are to contest the control of America. Our religious, social, educational, and political future is involved, and it is in order for Americans, whether Protestants or not, to inquire into the facts and principles and possibilities of the situation.

The recent articles in *The Atlantic Monthly* written by an unnamed priest who severely criticized certain features of Roman polity, drew forth a caustic attack upon the Protestant position by Mr. MacManus a few months ago, under the title, *The Nadir of Nothingness*. This Catholic writer made the Protestant principle of private judgment, with its lack of centralized and absolute authority, his main target. This has in turn moved ex-Senator George Wharton Pepper, a Protestant Episcopal layman, to reply in turn in a late issue of the magazine referred to. After frankly recognizing the fact that "religious antipathies in this country are at the present time deep and bitter," Mr. Pepper proceeds to outline the situation and the main principles at issue relative to Rome's claim to determine what men shall believe, and here are his opening sentences:

"I begin by disclaiming any intention to charge my Roman Catholic friends with 'mediaevalism.' When a philosophic or religious belief is under discussion, the question is not whether it is mediaeval, but whether it is valid. I suppose nobody would discount Chaucer's shrewd analysis of human character merely because he expressed himself in fourteenth-century English. On the other hand, I lay aside as unworthy, from every point of view except that of strategy, all oracular assertions that Protestantism is either the nadir or the zenith of nothingness. If it were, it would not have been worth while for Mr. MacManus to write. Intelligent people do not make so much ado about nothing. No: Catholicism and Protes-

tantism are forces to be recognized and dealt with. Nothing is gained by magnifying or belittling the potency of either of them.

"My starting point in a restatement of issues will be the obvious difference between the view that ultimate truth is to be found by those who search alone and the view that success is assured if the searchers hunt collectively. The individualist, as a solitary seeker after truth, searches for God, and, when found, establishes relations with Him in his own way. Nobody with any spiritual experience or with power of observation will be likely to deny that in multitudes of instances God's self-revelation to such seekers comes as an exceeding great reward. Others, however, hold that the revelation of divine truth is reserved for those who seek in groups which in size may range all the way down from the blessed company of all faithful people to the intimate association of a few like-minded friends.

"It is at this point that Mr. MacManus makes what seems to me to be his first serious mistake. He says that there are in the Western world to-day only two systems of religious thought: the authoritarian, or Catholic, and the sectarian, which is Protestant. Now the fact is that there are indeed two schools of Christian thought. One is pure individualism, which is neither Catholic nor Protestant, and the other is collectivism, which includes both Catholic and Protestant."

After an outline of church history, with a view to the sources of authority, Mr. Pepper takes up the claims of the pope:

"In virtue of the immediacy of his jurisdiction, the pope sustains a direct relation to each of the faithful, whether he be pastor or layman, and this relation results in a power of control which is not exercisable through the local bishop.

"Anyone who has even a slight understanding of military or political organization will perceive that under such a system the laity, as such, are privates in the ranks, without access to headquarters. The Church, like a state dominated by a powerful political organization, is in theory composed of the masses of the people. Practically, however, the Church is the clergy, and every clergyman, be he pastor of a flock or bishop of a diocese or member of a religious order, is subject to a control which, according to the point of view, is either salutary or the opposite. If Protestantism is poor on the side of authority, Roman Catholicism is bankrupt in the matter of representation.

"In order to state the issue presented by such a record, it is not necessary to use the language of violent controversy or even to discuss the relative merits of competing systems. The issue is obvious and inevitable. It is an inescapable fact that the vast majority of those who are subject to the Roman obedience must regard with something between amusement and contempt the decentralized systems of other Christian bodies. 'The Nadir of Nothingness' is merely an expression of this unhappy state of mind. On the other hand, it is similarly a fact that a like majority of those trained to revere democracy and representative government are restless and suspicious in the presence of a power which seems to them inconsistent with constitutional liberty. In the United States we are committed to the separation of executive, legislative, and judicial power, and we regard those in office as deriving their authority from the people. In the Roman Catholic Church the supreme executive, legislative, and judicial power is centred in one individual claiming to be divinely commissioned to speak in the name of Our Lord, and elected by cardinals who are themselves papal appointees. Mr. MacManus naturally resents the charge that Roman Catholics are deficient in loyalty to country. He must realize, however, that most popular judgments such as this are impervious to refined explanation. What will happen if Uncle Sam bids the devout Roman Catholic arise and do battle, while the pope by divine direction lays upon him a different injunction, is the kind of question which the man on the street is too impatient to debate. He settles it without hearing the other side.

"Most thoughtful people will agree with Mr. MacManus that what a man believes has a determining effect upon his conduct. But it by no means follows that his conduct will be determined by what he says he believes."

Mr. MacManus had come to the gloomy conclusion that under "sectarianism," there was no hope, but that "society is indubitably doomed." Taking up this point, Mr. Pepper says:

"It is difficult to understand, if the Roman Catholic position is sound, why there should be such black despair of its acceptance by the world. Mr. MacManus concedes that 'fifty or sixty or seventy million' of Americans are sufficiently 'straight-thinking, more or less logical-minded, consistent human beings' to have thought themselves out of the nothingness of Protestantism. They are not, then, invincibly ignorant. They are,

presumably, in a state of mind hospitable to a valid revelation of divine truth. A mind emancipated from one extreme is usually ready to take refuge in the other. It would seem, therefore, to be the day of boundless opportunity for the Roman Catholic Church. Yet in the presence of such opportunity Mr. MacManus despairs—and well he may. The simple fact is that imperialism may satisfy some of the people some of the time, but it cannot satisfy all of the people all of the time. It may be that there is something wrong with most of us or something wrong with imperialism; but for practical purposes the result is the same. If it were really true that there is no salvation outside the Roman Church, then the ultimate failure of Christianity and civilization might be not merely feared but confidently predicted. There are, however, multitudes of Christians who cannot be persuaded that their one chance of salvation lies in the acceptance of an ecclesiastical system which to them seems at war with the best that is in them. Between imperialists and anti-imperialists there is no possibility of reconciliation.”

PROBABLY NEVER BEFORE HAVE AMERICANS AS A WHOLE BEEN so deeply interested in Catholicism as this year. The Roman Church is conceded to a wonderfully complete and effective organization. Her long experience, her accumulation of wealth and power, the military obedience of those devoted to her service, have even given her credit for infallible wisdom and uncanny power. Yet her power is but the natural result of a solid organization obedient to the demands of its leaders. A Protestantism as dependably organized for its practical contacts with society, regardless of theological matters, would largely have a determining influence on the government in all moral affairs, and would command the profound respect and the power of the press. But Protestantism lacks such consolidation, though in the Anti-Saloon movement, eventuating in the Eighteenth Amendment, it approached something of the kind in effect.

In discussing the relation of Romanism and the press The Churchman touches upon this point in these paragraphs:

“The editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* complains that the startling articles published recently in his magazine—an attack

on his Church by a Roman priest—have received no publicity in the secular press.

“But all this is not the mystic or magic power of the Pope. It is a simple matter of business. Newspapers are printed for profit, just as any other merchandise is sold. Solvency depends upon a large circulation and advertising, and the two increase and decrease together. The newspapers in any city with a large Catholic population must not antagonize their readers or potential readers. When Christian Science became popular among large numbers in Boston the old ridicule in the daily papers gradually disappeared. We are certain that in any Fundamentalist citadel the newspapers are as careful not to offend the adherents of any sect of importance, however childish their views, for fear of a substantial loss of business.

“This all sounds very mercenary, but is surely inevitable. We have heard on good authority that a well-known New York newspaper, which has had an undeserved reputation for sensationalism, upon attempting for a time not to feature the Snyder-Gray case, lost through the competition of less scrupulous sheets about eighty thousand sales a day. The editors felt compelled to follow the fashion and prevent further loss.

“This is an insidious influence upon the news columns. It forces us to read all the papers with many grains of salt. But we will accomplish nothing by merely attacking the Church of Rome. If Protestantism were as well organized, with the same articulate utterance, we should be equally feared. But we are divided, and, also, we are more tolerant of criticism.”

THE GENERAL MOVEMENT TO ABOLISH WAR SPRINGS FROM THE highest motives, and even if it resulted in preventing no more than a single conflict between two relatively unimportant nations it would be worth while. However, when one follows the trend of affairs in Europe and expert comment upon it he cannot be blamed if he falls into a doubt whether perpetual peace is going to arrive by way of formal attempts to establish it.

The nations of Europe are suffering from a chronic peril of armed conflict, even expectation of it, due, in part at least, to the war virus that has infected them for ages. It is the historic attitude of mind on the Continent, on occasion of

serious international differences. Americans do not appreciate how commonly this specter disturbs the peace of nations there.

While they are still aching from the wounds of the World War is a good time to press any scheme that promises to prevent a similar disaster. So we might have expected that Secretary Kellogg's proposal would at least have serious consideration. But, if such an experienced and astute observer of Continental affairs as Frank H. Simonds is right, the response of the accepting nations is disappointing in two ways. In the first place, financial necessity seems to have been the main influence in prompting acceptance; in the second, the agreement entered into will not very notably reduce the likelihood of further warfare. Here are two extracts from a careful analysis by this writer in *The American Review of Reviews*:

"That brings us back squarely to the Kellogg proposal. To the European mind the major consideration is that we are going to be vitally important for Europe during the next twelve months. The whole question of reparations and debts is coming up, as I have indicated. If we refuse to modify our debt policy, if we decline to find the funds for further German loans, if we refuse to open our market for the gigantic bond issue that Europe has in view, then the consequences for Europe are manifest.

"In that situation what could be less intelligent than to irritate American public opinion, and the present Administration, by rejecting out of hand the Kellogg proposal? Provided only the appropriate reservations can be found to safeguard European interests, what could be more advantageous and less expensive than an acceptance in form of the proposal to outlaw war?

"The proposal itself is not taken seriously in Europe, save in certain restricted quarters in Great Britain. Under normal circumstances it would be denounced, because from abroad it seems to be a deliberate and designed attack upon the whole League of Nations machinery and methods.

"In view of all the present circumstances the easy way is not to attack, but to amend the proposal. That is precisely what all the replies so far received have intended. Just as soon as enough reservations have been attached to the Kellogg proposal to leave everybody just where they stood before, it is to be accepted."

"Naturally the Kellogg resolution does not touch any one of the situations in Europe which are actual menaces to peace. It will not change the German determination to recover the Polish Corridor, or persuade the Poles to surrender it. It will not abolish the Vilna dispute between Poland and Lithuania. Least of all does it modify Hungarian conditions, which are unacceptable to a whole people.

"Since it does not in the least change the dangers, reduce or remove any one of them, the Kellogg resolution cannot modify or abolish the machinery which Europe has prepared to protect it against calamities which are always possible, and at times seem well-nigh inevitable. While these dangers remain all discussion of outlawing war is, for those actually menaced, more or less academic."

OUT OF THE TURMOIL OF OUR AGE THERE ARE EMERGING THINGS not only unforeseen, but once thought practically impossible. One of these is a drawing toward each other of religion and social radicalism. Is there any real evidence that socialism is dropping its old antagonism to Christianity? It seems that there is, at any rate in Germany. Time is modifying the old type of socialism there, and with moderation comes greater breadth of view. Of course, this does not mean that we are to expect a great spiritual revival by way of any group of social theorists. It is simply that the old bitter suspicion, hatred, and opposition are passing.

In its comments upon affairs in general The British Weekly has given a summary of this change, which because of its religious importance, we give in full:

"The tide of Socialism in Germany is moving gradually towards a better relationship with the churches. It was a sign of the times that the veteran Karl Kautsky, 'the intellectual heir of Marx,' should have published in his 73rd year a large work in two volumes on the materialistic conception of history, in which he virtually abandons his master's theory. Students who have followed Kautsky's writings in books, pamphlets and newspaper articles will remember how sternly he once opposed Bernstein's doctrine of a revisionist or progressive Socialism. He clung to the idea of Marx that the dawn must break in thunder; that amid earthquake convulsions and blinding flashes the disinherited and downtrodden masses would overthrow their

oppressors. Kautsky remains to-day, as he always was, an incorruptible Socialist, but he has watched with horror the ten years of Communist rule in Russia, which threatens to degrade man's spirit to the level of the beast. The word 'materialism' has lost its attraction for him in the light of this fearful experiment. Twenty-two years ago, in a pamphlet entitled 'Social Democracy and the Catholic Church,' he admitted that it was possible to be a Socialist and at the same time a Christian. He must have watched, if we are not mistaken, with sympathetic interest the recent discussion in the German Socialist press on the work of the Rhenish editor, George Beyer, 'The Catholic Church and Socialism' (Berlin, 1927). Kautsky believed in his youth that the Socialist movement stood nearer to Primitive Christianity than any other modern movement, since both had their origin among the masses. He has lived to see the German Social Democrats seeking a point of contact with the Roman Catholic centre in the Reichstag. An account of this political movement is contributed by Walter Koch to *Sozialistische Monatshefte* for April 19. The writer believes that the Centre and the Social Democrats must coalesce in order to secure the future of Germany. But the old question remains: 'How can two walk together except they be agreed?' Attacks on the Roman Church by men like the late Wilhelm Liebknecht, by Kautsky and many others, form an unforgotten chapter in German Socialist literature. George Beyer and his supporters are making advances to the Roman Church. They appeal for a new tolerance, a more generous understanding. The young Socialist must turn his thoughts to religion; the young Catholic must seek a new brotherhood with the people. 'Nil in medium,' said the old fighters as they looked across the gulf. German Socialists realise to-day that the higher forces of humanity may eventually be compelled to unite against the dark companionships."

FOR A SUBJECT SO OLD, MARRIAGE AS AN INSTITUTION IS HOLDING a singularly large amount of space in the newspaper headlines. The reason is that marriage is on the defensive. Transparent and fantastic substitutes for marriage are put forward, but fail to disguise the plain licentiousness that is back of them. Meantime the divorce evil grows into an accepted commonplace of domestic life. Certainly it is time for the church to be heard in the matter, and in a voice of authority. In Zion's

Herald, Clyde Lemont Hay has outlined the Christian meaning of marriage and the duty of the church toward it. After reference to the general biological and social aspects of marriage he continues:

"But it is in the light of Christianity that marriage achieves its larger meanings. From this point of view the union of man and wife becomes something vastly more than a biological necessity as a means of race propagation; it is a pathway to larger self-realization, to higher spheres of happiness, and to more complete development of the spiritual life. Protestantism, in its recoil from Roman ecclesiasticism, rejected all the sacraments but two, those of baptism and the Lord's Supper. However, Romanism was far from wrong when she imputed to marriage a sacramental significance. The catechism defines a sacrament as 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.' Such is the sacramental significance of marriage that St. Paul made it the symbol of the union of Christ with His church (Eph. 5), and, if this figure has any validity at all, then there should be a close relationship between marriage and the achievement of a higher state of inward spiritual grace.

"We think it warranted to assume that not every marriage is sacramental in the same degree. Matrimony gathers deeper meanings in proportion to the higher character and purposes of those entering into it. Some marriages are conceived in bestiality and have no other meaning for the participants; to some, marriage means nothing but brutal domination on the one side and servile vassalage on the other; to some, it is merely a means of larger social and economic advantage. The church has a definite obligation to preach and teach the proper spiritual meaning and possibilities of marriage, and has a right to expect that the marriages which she solemnizes shall be entered into in a sacramental spirit."

BOOKS

CHRISTIANITY, PAST AND PRESENT¹

THIS is an interesting book, at least in that it challenges attention and provokes fresh thinking along lines that are fundamental to the very genius of historic Christianity.

First of all, in the more superficial sense, it makes a genuine appeal by virtue of the fact that it is interestingly, even brilliantly, written. It is never dull reading, and many of its sentences fascinate with a certain inevitableness of expression. It is a pleasure to read an author whose style, in spite of the perhaps unavoidable inadequacy of translation, is so free from the commonplace.

The title, Christianity, Past and Present, might lead one to classify the book as history, especially since Dr. Guignebert is professor of the History of Christianity in the University of Paris. But this would be a mistake; it is not history. The first essentials in the writing of that which can truly claim to be history are, fairness in assembling all the facts which are vital to any given situation, and an unbiased detachment in estimating their real significance. This is precisely what is not found in this book. Instead of this the author has a definite thesis to maintain, a particular point of view which controls in the selection of his material and always forewarns of the interpretation which is sure to be arrived at. This thesis is thus frankly stated in the Preface:

"It is the main outlines of a history which it [the present volume] tries to delineate *so as to prove, if possible*, that not only in its dogmas, but also throughout the ramifications of its whole organism a religion undergoes *the process of evolution*." (Italics are the reviewer's.)

This, then, is not a history, but an interpretation of his-

¹Christianity, Past and Present. By Charles Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Paris. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xxvi+507.

tory. Nor is it an interpretation in the making of which the author invites the reader to join him in an open-minded search for a true point of view, but rather the history is avowedly delineated "so as to prove, if possible" a specific and aggressively postulated theory. This is not necessarily an objectionable attitude for a writer to assume, but it should be recognized in any attempt to estimate the value of his book. It transforms what might have ranked as scientific research into special pleading, and it sometimes helps one to understand the selection of the material.

The idea which gives form to the whole book is that Christianity, in its origin and in its entire historical development, is properly explainable through an evolutionary process which resulted from all sorts of merely human contacts. To quote the opening paragraph of Professor Muzzey's review in *The Saturday Review of Literature*, of February 25, 1928:

"The definitive cleavage in religion is between those who accept a supernatural revelation in the Scriptures or in the dogmas of the Church and those who do not. For the former the entire history of Christianity is but the unfolding of a drama whose plot is implicit in the purpose of God: its method is deductive, apologetic, teleological, and theological. For the latter the history of Christianity is the evolution of the teachings of a Syrian peasant prophet, which came at divers times into contact with such various transforming influences as the mystery religions of the East, the speculations of Hellenistic philosophy, the disciplinary rigor of the Roman Empire, Teutonic chaos, feudal arrogance, aristocratic Humanism, rivalistic nationalism, the recurrent visions of democracy, and the persistent curiosities of science. The history is traceable in purely human terms, without recourse to miracle or 'metaphysical aid'; its method is inductive, disinterested, objective, and pragmatic. M. Guignebert belongs to the latter class."

That is, the history of Christianity is to be studied, and analyzed, and explained apart from any recognition of God, of His immanence, or of His purpose in the unfolding history of the Christian church. One can understand why in a later paragraph Professor Muzzey suggests that there may be those who

"may deplore the deficiency of religion in Professor Guignebert's book."

Another lack in the instrument which is used to measure the process of evolution, which it is claimed explains Christianity in all its stages of development, is the failure to reckon with the religious nature of man as an element contributing to that evolution. To be sure, the author says, "A very powerful atavistic tendency, difficult to eradicate, exists in us" (Preface, p. viii); but in the outworking of the thesis of the book scant attention is paid to the creative compulsions of personal faith and aspiration, hope and consecration and longing for fellowship with God. Doubtless the factors which Professor Guignebert adduces did play an important part in the history of Christianity. His volume is a very stimulating one. Students of history of all schools will find much to aid, and much to challenge, thought in the theory he has so ably developed. But one could wish that he had included among the factors in "the process of evolution" a sympathetic understanding of those mighty spiritual imponderables which throughout the centuries have expressed themselves in self-dedication and fortitude and "death defying witness unto truth."

What devout Roman Catholic would agree to the analysis given in the chapter entitled *The Origin of the Papacy*? And there are millions of devout Roman Catholics. Is their faith not a factor in the development of history? Is Dr. Guignebert correct when he says, "that Christ had no intent to found the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman church is a truth which it is no longer necessary to demonstrate" (p. 228)? Certainly not from the standpoint of the great army of those who have lived and wrought and died in that belief.

What believing Protestant—and there are millions of them—would acknowledge as valid the reasonings of the chapter which traces the Reformation mainly to the influence of "humanism." Did Luther renounce the alluring opportunities of the career which was just opening before him and enter the monastery because he was a humanist? Or because his heart was crying out for God? Did he make his heroic stand before

the Diet of Worms because he was a humanist? Has the faith of the multitudes who have followed him in his search for God, and having found, have dedicated their all to Him—has their faith and their experience of fellowship with Him not contributed, perhaps more than any other factor, to the evolution of Christian history?

After all, the most disheartening thing about this book is none of these things, but the application of the same principles which control in the analysis of the history of Christianity to the Founder of Christianity, to the career of Jesus Himself. A Syrian peasant prophet, who may or may not have thought of himself as the Messiah, and who failed—nothing more. And of His contribution to the religious history of the race—

“In the form given to Christianity as the result of the initiative of Jesus and his direct disciples, it could not have persisted outside purely Jewish circles, for as a doctrine it was meaningless save for them” (p. 496).

No wonder the book closes in almost unqualified pessimism. As far as Roman Catholicism is concerned, it “can no longer evolve”:

“Logically, as well as historically, it does not seem as if it will find any other fate than that which remains for us all when we have used up our strength and filled out the number of our days—to break up and die, to return to Nature the elements lent by her, that she may use them again according to her good pleasure. It is thus, moreover, that all religions end, religions which, like living organisms, are born of a need, nourished upon death, die day by day of life, and finally lapse again into the eternal crucible.” (P. 507.)

Nor is Protestantism in a much more hopeful plight, although it is recognized that the freedom involved in the Reformation principles does prepare the way for some new, though not yet discerned, evolution.

And yet this should be a useful book. Useful because it so definitely calls attention to an aspect of truth too often neglected or unduly minimized. Useful because of its very frankness, a frankness which reveals the whither of the hypothesis upon which its argument is founded. Useful because of its

masterly ability, whose brilliance of thought and of expression fails to make any less distressing the pessimistic denouement promised by its basic theory. Useful because of the renewed confidence that it will bring to those who, after all has been said, still believe in the God of the Christian centuries, in Christ, the Son of the living God, the Saviour of the world, and in the full and satisfying salvation which they themselves have experienced as they sought the Heavenly Father through Him.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

THE WRESTLE OF RELIGION WITH TRUTH²

DR. WIEMAN first attracted the attention of the reading public by his book entitled *Religious Experience and Scientific Method*, which was published in 1926, while he was still professor in the department of philosophy, at Occidental College. This present book announces that he has recently entered upon his duties as professor in the department of philosophy at Chicago Divinity School. The two books deal with the same problem in slightly different form. Some reviewers herald Dr. Wieman as the new Moses who at last has appeared to lead modern religious thinkers out of the bondage in which the exclusive control of the "scientific method" has fettered them.

The qualifications which seem to fit Dr. Wieman for this role arise out of the fact that he is heartily in sympathy with the scientific method and its meaning, and he meets the scientific mind on its own ground and with its own chosen weapons. The reader is in danger of suffering from reactions and misunderstandings unless he has clearly in mind at the outset that Dr. Wieman is baiting his hook for a certain kind of mind and spirit. This book is not designed primarily for the religious, who already have their religious convictions fervently functioning, and who appreciate the meaning, value, and truth of its propositions and experience. This group will be inclined to feel the insufficiency of his treatment of almost every theme.

² *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth.* By Henry Nelson Wieman. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xii+256. Index.

He starts too far away from his goal, and thins out religion too finely for its life.

But when it is appreciated that Dr. Wieman is endeavoring to find some solid basis for religious experience where the nonreligious scientist will be willing to start with him in his thinking, this elimination process is clearly understood. If religious experience can be reduced to the point where the nonreligious scientist will be forced to recognize its scientific soundness, much intellectual strength will be gained. Dr. Wieman, we are sure, would readily admit that the average person is not as hard-headed as the scientifically-minded prospects he is seeking to win. So it is not always necessary to press religious experience to the degree of analysis to which he carries it. But there are such scientifically-minded people, and they usually hold strategic positions, such as teachers, writers or lecturers, so that their popular influence is very great. To know where to find a discussion of religious experience which can successfully deal with this group is important.

Sociology and psychology have made our modern world talk and think in terms of environment, behavior, adjustment. If religion is to be intelligently discussed with the educated moderns it must be couched in these popular terms. Talk about religion in these terms, and they are at home. Dr. Wieman adopts this terminology from the start. Even God is defined thus:

"Very briefly, God is that feature of our total environment which most vitally affects the continuance and welfare of human life. More specifically, God is that character of events to which man must adjust himself in order to attain the greatest goods and avoid the greatest ills." (P. 14.)

To the deeply interested religious mind this definition of God is far from satisfying. But when it falls into the hands of the sociologically and psychologically trained person, it is instantly welcomed. It talks in the terms they are in the habit of using. It sounds satisfactorily scientific, and this means much for favorable consideration. For, if the sociologist and the psychologist are to find God, they will have to find Him

somewhere in environment, behavior, and adjustment. Such is Dr. Wieman's attitude, and so he chooses this scientific air port for his take-off. However, the place from which he takes off is not as important as the place where he lands. The word lands is advisedly used. For this philosophical journey is not made over the old-time land route. It is by air, and stops only at a few well-selected places. In order that the reader may be sure that we are to travel by a new route we will divide religious people into his groups. He says:

"With respect to religion there are three classes of people: the religious rationalizers, the irreligious rationalizers and the religiously inquisitive. The first class may think about religion from the outside to defend it; the second class may think about it from the outside to destroy it. But only the third class thinks about it from the inside with a view to discovering precisely what may be the good of it." (P. 35.)

In order to get religion in the field where it will meet the demands of Dewey's pragmatic philosophy it has to be made a problem. How else can one think about it? So we read:

"Only this third class makes of religion a problem. The other two merely accept it or reject it without examining into it. This book is an attempt to coöperate with the third class and, possibly, to win more coöperators." (P. 35.)

Dr. Wieman is out to make people think about religion along new lines. He is after thinkers. Of course it is betraying no secret to tell the reader that, though the author courageously joins the group of the religiously inquisitive, who make of religion a problem, he is not taking any great risks, because he has the answer already worked out. What he really wants is to persuade the "religious rationalizers" and "the irreligious rationalizers" to desert their traditional groups and to accompany him on his flight of exploration. We can assure the reader that he is taking no great risk in joining the group of the religiously inquisitive as long as it is conducted by Dr. Wieman.

The religious-minded may be somewhat alarmed by the opening sentences of the second chapter. They run:

"Three uses may be made of the idea of God. It may be used to edify, to convert the sinner and comfort the saint, to stabilize society and uplift humanity; or it may be used to achieve conformity to ancient religious tradition; or for purposes of experimentation. It is the last of these three which interests us just now." (P. 54.)

That is, in dealing with a scientifically-minded group, the only way the idea of God can be accepted is for experimental purposes. The hypothesis with which this experiment begins is the following:

"God is that in the universe which will yield maximum security and increase of human good when lives are properly adjusted to him" (p. 59).

Let us proceed at this point with true scientific caution. This proposition needs examination. This the author gives as follows:

"In the first place we know with certainty that this proposition refers to something truly existent in the total environment with which we interact. Just what it is we do not know. If we did know there would be no need to investigate." (P. 59.)

Surely no scientific mind can object to such mentally tempered progress. Let us advance another step:

"How do we know it is good when we do not profess to know what it is? Because, by definition, it is that Something, however unknown, which would and which does bring human life to the largest fulfilment when proper adjustment is made to it." (P. 59.)

This particular maneuver by definition is somewhat questionable, and, we fear, will not inspire confidence in the minds of the scientifically-minded. But it brings confidence to the heart of the religiously-minded. And it is to them that the next few appeals are made. So we read:

"Now the whole welfare of man depends upon attaining a certain correlation between human behavior and the behavior of the universe, especially in respect to those phases of the universal behavior which bear most critically upon human life. Human life has come into existence because of a certain be-

havior going on in the universe. Human life has advanced from its most lowly and miserable stages to its highest attainments because of a certain behavior going on in the universe and the adaptation of man's behavior to it." (P. 61.)

We now come to the religious content of this behavior:

"Human life has been cradled and fostered by this behavior of the universe. God is that behavior of the universe which has thus nurtured human life and which continues to keep it going and growing." (P. 61 f.)

Let us follow this description of God a little further:

"He is that special kind of behavior in the universe which is most beneficent to humankind. He is that behavior which has brought forth human life upon this planet and continues to provide for it despite all the follies and evils of men. He is, therefore, that behavior in the universe which is best distinguished from all other by calling it Father, just as we distinguish certain other behavior by calling it Sam Jones." (P. 62.)

This concluding observation may seem like descending from the sublime to the ridiculous. But our author is under the necessity of making a very difficult flight from the field of sociology to the personality field of psychology, and the fog is dense, so we will have to forgive him a little confusion. The visibility is low. A greater change of intellectual climate and level is yet to come:

"But just what is this behavior of the universe which is Father God? We do not know with any clarity and fulness. We cannot discover it by means of any of the techniques of the several sciences, because the scope of each of these is too limited. The behavior which these sciences can investigate is only of the simplest sort due to the narrow limitations under which our present scientific technique labors." (P. 62 f.)

We are leaving the exact sciences now. Their instruments are failing us. We will have to trust to our instincts, intuitions, and common sense. The author prepares his readers for this parting by adding to what has already been said the following:

"No science, for example, can portray that total com-

plexity of behavior called human personality, not because personality is unknowable but because its behavior is too complex for any technique thus far developed" (p. 63).

Yet we are not without resources:

"Nevertheless, while the exact and refined methods of science cannot investigate God, we have the experimental methods of common sense. We can live experimentally, as the saints and prophets have always lived who have given us whatever valuable information we have about God." (P. 63.)

When we started off on this new scientific method of experiment with the idea of God, we did not expect to find ourselves so soon back in the familiar company of the saints and the prophets. We rather thought that we were going to travel on this tour with the modern up-to-date scientists, such as sociologists, psychologists, and naturalistic philosophers. But for some reason their type of experimentation does not seem to have led to the company of the religious. We now receive a warning which can easily be understood by the religious:

"We must not forget, however, that experimental living is hazardous living. It is far more hazardous than any scientific experiment because it involves the whole life, not merely biological existence which may well be sacrificed in scientific investigation. But in religious inquiry one must cast into the experiment those larger goods, including all that one holds dear, his moral character, his highest aspirations, his greatest loves and loyalties, those things without which mere bodily existence is worthless." (P. 64.)

It is hardly necessary to call the attention of the religious to the fact that their experimental living is a hazardous undertaking. The prophets, the martyrs, the saints know the cost of their ventures. Hazardous experiments among scientists are still news. Not so among the prophets. This phase of the experiment is gathered up in this passage:

"In order to plumb the depths of the world's behavior, in order to bring to the surface that deep working of the universe which is God, upon which must depend the most abundant living, one must stake his dearest and greatest goods upon a

venture. Then, when he has done his utmost and given his all, he must wait and listen quite helplessly to see if the world responds, to see if there rises up from the hidden sources of behavior that which will sustain his venture." (P. 65 f.)

Quite appropriately Professor Wieman introduces his Christology at this point of the discussion:

"There is no better example in this world's history of such venturing than that of Jesus in Gethsemane and on the cross, crying, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' The response came, magnificently, at last, after his death, carrying his work on to fulfilment. He revealed the most of God because he made the uttermost experiment." (P. 66.)

The author now turns to the question of the hypothesis on which Jesus made His experiment:

"What was Jesus's proposition? What was the hypothesis he was testing by the experiment of his life? We would not presume to formulate it precisely, but surely it had something to do with love. Was there in the universe a behavior, however latent, which would respond to love?" (P. 66.)

This question is pressed more intimately in the next paragraph:

"If he loved intelligently, honestly, without sentimentality, unreservedly, would the behavior of the world swing into line and support the venture? Was love truly more mighty than violence, more irresistible than logic or art or any social institution or organization except as these embodied love? Was the complete lifelong self-surrender of love for God and man the way to make adjustment to that hidden behavior of the universe which would sustain the maximum security and increase of human good?" (P. 66 f.)

This discussion of the method of religious inquiry closes with this final statement:

"Jesus made the experiment. The results are not yet all in; the experiment is not completed. The decision still hangs in the balance. But Jesus was experimenting. He was testing a proposition in order to make manifest and pervasive throughout human living that behavior of the universe which is God." (P. 67.)

Having thus far taken care of the needs of the sociologist, the psychologist, and the religiously-minded, the author now turns his attention to the philosopher. For this is his particular field. He selects as his pilot for this stage of the flight a philosopher who has had his training in the field of pure mathematics, Professor Whitehead. Their first landing place, to the surprise of many, is in the field of esthetics. Professor Whitehead is held responsible for the selection of this air port. From a long quotation from his book entitled, *Religion in the Making*, we give this passage:

"All order is therefore aesthetic order, and the moral order is merely certain aspects of aesthetic order. The actual world is the outcome of the aesthetic order, and the aesthetic order is derived from the immanence of God" (quoted on p. 186).

By this move the scientifically-minded members of the tour are transported out of their element. But, having gone so far, they cannot drop out of the group. From now on the tables are turned; they are to receive, not impart, information. Their esthetic education begins at once with this statment:

"Why is the most basic order of the universe, and the order to be identified with God, the aesthetic rather than the moral or conceptual? Because the aesthetic is most rich and full. The aesthetic is the order of concreteness. The moral and the conceptual represent the orders of certain abstract features of the world. The aesthetic order includes the moral and conceptual and much more, because it is the order of the total concrete fulness of the world. God, then, is to be found in the aesthetic order, rather than in the moral or conceptual, although the two latter are included as abstract features." (P. 186 f.)

It is at this point that Professor Wieman adopts Professor Whitehead's idea that God is the principle of concreteness. He is the mathematician's principle of limitation. "God," he says, "tends to make the universe ever more concrete" (p. 189). Out of this process the conceptual and moral grow:

"Men can become morally good only insofar as they incorporate in themselves this sustaining order whereby each shares in all and all in each. . . . To be moral, then, men must be more than moral. They must be aesthetic. And to be profoundly aesthetic, in Whitehead's sense, is to be religious." (P. 189 f.)

The book closes with two very pertinent observations. The first is:

"But we cannot stop with concepts clarified and systematized by philosophy, as though philosophy were the culmination of life and a substitute for the experimental processes of religious living" (p. 252).

The second:

"We must apply our concepts, clarified and systematized, to the interaction between organism and environment in order to control life in such a way as to achieve that wider use and fuller appreciation of the concrete wealth of experience which bears such names as social intercourse, love, beauty and mystic communion with God" (p. 253).

It has been necessary to give numerous quotations from the book because the nature of the author's treatment is so unusual that, without them, any attempt to give the gist of his position would be sure to lead to serious misunderstanding. At a glance the reader can know the method and message of the writer.

We believe the book has a large field of usefulness. The expert sociologists, psychologists, and naturalistic philosophers, whom Dr. Wieman set out to convert, will not be won. But there are multitudes of teachers, preachers, religious workers, and students who have been disturbed by the materialistic and mechanistic theories of the social sciences, and who like to consider themselves scientifically-minded, to whom this book will bring help and satisfaction. And it is among this group that its reception already has been very enthusiastic.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

THE SECOND ISAIAH³

MOST people who have acquainted themselves at all with critical opinions on the Old Testament are aware of the fact that Isaiah has been divided into two books, chapters 40-66 being commonly known as "II Isaiah." This division of Isaiah has been called, as a matter of fact, one of the axioms of criticism—a sort of self-evident position. Perhaps not many realize the chaos which criticism has produced in the writings of this prophet. There could be no more erroneous impression than that each of these two parts is a unified whole; within each one of them scholars find seams and divisions almost too numerous to mention. Certainly it is an astonishing thing to discover that the second half of the book has become a problem of the most difficult kind with as many solutions as there are critics. The result has been to turn one of the passages of Scripture most loved by devout believers into a battle ground of theories, with a very low rating indeed in the eyes of the learned men who have interested themselves in it.

To this situation Professor C. C. Torrey of Yale has addressed himself in this volume on *The Second Isaiah*. As Professor of Semitic Languages he brings to the work special talents, and is bound to have a hearing. The above brief statement of the critical situation is a mild expression of his own opinions on the status of the critical work on this great prophecy. One of the things that will impress the reader from the very first page is the outspoken way in which the work of other scholars is denounced. Cheyne, Marti, and above all, Duhm come in for very severe treatment indeed; in fact, a conservative scholar would hardly venture to treat his opponents in such a way for fear of the bitter denunciation he would call down upon his head forthwith. Now, however, if anyone is seeking scathing terms in which to expose the fallacies of critical theorizing, he will find an arsenal in this work by Professor Torrey of Yale. To quote an example:

³ *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation.* By Charles Cutler Torrey, Professor of Semitic Languages in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1928. Pp. xiv+477. Index.

"The aspect of Isaiah 40-66 in the *Polychrome Bible* is only a little more mournful than it is in nearly every modern text-book and treatise. Instead of a comprehensive unit, the best scholarship of the present day offers us here only an incomprehensible scrap-heap. . . . We have here a good example of that which has happened not a few times, in the history of literary criticism, where scholars have felt obliged to pare down a writing to make it fit a mistaken theory. The paring process, begun with a penknife, is continued with a hatchet, until the book has been chopped into hopeless chunks." (P. 13.)

Words such as these are characteristic of the entire work. The author takes issue with most of the accepted opinions about Second Isaiah. Not the least of the merits of this position is the fact that it makes the discussion interesting—which is more than can be said for some other books in this field. Besides, if we feel led to differ with the author on some points we may be bold to do so in view of the freedom of his own expression.

The contents of the book are in three main divisions. The first comprises twelve literary and critical essays in which the special point of view being advocated is set forth. The second part contains a translation of Isaiah 34-35, 40-66 (chs. 34-35 are included in this volume). Of this part it is sufficient to say here that the translation is a real translation, and neither a paraphrase in modern speech nor an awkward attempt at literalism; and that it is printed to show the poetic structure of the entire twenty-nine chapters covered. In the third part will be found the critical notes, separate from the text. They are arranged with an introduction to each poem, a paragraph explaining the metrical arrangement, and notes on the details. Both arrangement and contents make this a valuable book for the student of Isaiah.

Both Professor Torrey and the publishers claim that this volume gives a new view of Second Isaiah, on the basis of evidence hitherto unknown or inadequately treated. We shall therefore review this evidence and estimate this novelty.

Briefly stated, the "new thing" here presented is the idea

that Second Isaiah contains absolutely no reference whatever to the exile in Babylon. The common notion, that this was written to encourage the people of the captivity, to stimulate their interest in a return to Palestine, and to strengthen their faith in the God of Israel under these historic conditions, is entirely mistaken. This notion is merely the result of a blind adherence to a theory; it is not due to a true interpretation of the book itself; the work of the great thinker who produced it has been nullified for us in this age by an erroneous assumption.

To what, then, does this prophecy refer? The author's position is, that it has to do only with the coming age, when Israel's world mission would come to fulfilment. The central figure who at times appears in these pages is the Messiah, not a contemporary, or a prophet, or Cyrus. The people addressed are, not the exiles (whose very existence as a historic group Professor Torrey doubts), but the scattered Jews of the world, in danger of losing their national solidarity. The date of the prophecy is not the time of Cyrus, as has been commonly supposed, but 400 B.C., and the place of writing is the Jerusalem of that later time, with the rival Samaritan people on the north and with internal conditions which can be clearly inferred from the contents of these chapters. One example of the expression of the author's position may be given:

"Second Isaiah is indeed a prophecy of release from bondage and triumphant return of 'exiles' to Jerusalem by sea and land; but the prophet is looking to the ends of the earth, not to Babylonia. There is indeed prediction, definite and many times repeated, of the speedy advent of a great conqueror and deliverer, the restorer of Israel and benefactor of the world; but the prophet is speaking of the Anointed Servant of the Lord, the Son of David, not the son of Cambyses." (P. 37.)

On what grounds does Professor Torrey make what he calls a radical departure from the accepted results of criticism? The first fact to be considered is the mention of Cyrus in 44:28 and 45:1, together with the three times that Babylon and Chaldea are expressly named, 43:14; 48:14; and 48:20. All

these are interpolations. Nothing but a blind adherence to the theory of an exilic date has prevented us from seeing long ago that they were all out of place, both in their several contexts and in the section as a whole. Had the faculty of common sense been allowed to operate unhindered this would have been perfectly plain. If we ask how we know that these are interpolations, seeing that cutting them out comes dangerously near assuming the thing to be proved, we are told that we know it by poetic structure, by the immediate context in each case, and by the result for the whole twenty-nine chapters, which clearly become a unit when these passages are removed. These are three of the eight lines of argument advanced by the author. (See p. 50.)

Why did anyone thus interpolate these passages or words in this great poem? The fault all lies originally in the evil effect of the work of the chronicler. The original writer, in the depth of his religious feeling and with the power of his poetic nature, told of a coming gathering of the scattered people of God. Some pious Jew read the account as given in 2 Chronicles of the return under Zerubbabel. He was impressed with the fact that many of the things mentioned in the prophecy have a remarkable correspondence to the supposed events in the history. Being but a superficial reader, he put the two into a relation with each other which they never had. He inserted the fateful words, Cyrus, Babylon, and Chaldea, at effective points to give definite reference to the prophet's words, and the result was achieved. For centuries all the Jewish and Christian world has been deceived. It will be noted that this theory of the origin of these interpolations presupposes the unreliability of the chronicler. Professor Torrey does not at all accept the view of the exile and the return to which most people are accustomed. Neither of these events is to be accepted as recorded in the Old Testament.

To continue with the argument one step more, when did this work of interpolation take place?

"As for the date of the interpolation, this only can be said, that it was between the time when the theory of the great re-

turn of 'all Israel' from Babylonia under Cyrus arose (before the middle of the third century) and the time when the Greek translation of Isaiah was made" (p. 51).

This statement, we believe, sets forth the heart of the author's theory as to Second Isaiah. Many of the above sentences are supported by arguments which we have no opportunity here to consider in detail. In passing, however, certain things suggest themselves to the reader. One is the character of this interpolator who is responsible for twenty-two centuries of confusion, a man with a pious regard for the Scriptures as he had them, clever enough to find just the proper places in which to interpolate, yet not clever enough so to fit them in that the keen observer today cannot detect them, and either careless or dishonest enough to produce a wrong impression and create this age-long confusion. This man, along with the number of others who have performed similar feats in our Old Testament, is a person who surely gives us pause.

In the second place, we raise the question as to whether the exilic background is to be so easily disposed of. We are prepared to admit that the emphasis on Cyrus and Babylon has indeed been overdone; it is true that there is very little in the Second Isaiah to suggest that the writer was in Babylon when he composed this great production. There is likewise very little to suggest the times around 400 B.C. in the opinion of some. But there are many things indeed which fit perfectly into Jerusalem before 600 B.C., and one cannot but wish that they too were given their due weight.

To mention only one other passing thought, we find it rather difficult to square the procedure of these early Jewish writers with anything that even resembles an evangelical doctrine of Scripture. If it be true that erroneous impressions have been created for posterity by the ill-directed efforts of pious patriots 250 B.C., then the consequences for God's Word are very serious indeed. Doubtless we are here at a point of view diametrically opposed to that of the distinguished author. There are still some students of Isaiah, however, to whom this thought is bound to occur.

A word must be said as to the novelty of these views of Isaiah. One cannot but be struck with the fact that a great many of the ideas here expressed are not absolutely new. This is not the first time that the elimination of Cyrus and Babylon by a theory of interpolation has been suggested. Professor Torrey lays great emphasis on the poetic structure of the book; yet students have been impressed with this feature from the first. In both cases it is a new emphasis which these features receive. Again, the unity of the twenty-nine chapters is mentioned many times as though it were a new discovery; the characteristic thoughts, such as the argument from history (see p. 67 ff.), are dwelt upon as indications that the whole is the product of one great mind during a single brief period of its activity. Yet there have been many people all the time, if we are not mistaken, who have been impressed with the unity of this great prophecy, and for them there is little new in this suggestion. The universality of the author, his humanity, his insight, his dramatic talent, have been qualities known and admired on all sides. As was remarked before, it is not even a new thing to a great many readers to learn that the Babylonian background is a very much over-emphasized feature, and that the prominence of Palestine in Second Isaiah is a fact worthy of much more attention than it has received.

Yet let it not be thought that this volume has no contributions to the study of this prophet which give us cause for gratitude to the author. The new thing for which we are grateful is the fact that at last a voice has been raised within critical circles in behalf of a section of our Old Testament which has suffered much at the hands of its supposed friends. It is indeed a new thing to hear the unity and greatness of Isaiah 40-66 so ardently defended by a man of Professor Torrey's standing.

"It has been shown that the twenty-seven poems of this publication stand in a fixed order. It is also evident that there is a comprehensive plan of the series, conceived at first as an open frame-work and then freely worked out in detail. All the way from the announcement to the world in 34:1 to the grim

warning to the renegades of Israel in 66:23 f. (after all, the prophet's most earnest message) a certain logical progress is unmistakable. . . . With the weight of a new world on his shoulders and the full realization of a desperate surrounding condition that would have checked the enthusiasm of a lesser soul, he lays out the technical scheme, sometimes quite elaborate, of each of the successive compositions, and calculates his rhetorical effects, while from time to time little touches of a lighter humor reveal his own indomitable spirit." (P. 203 f.)

For such estimates of the author we give thanks. It may be that at last a great man is coming into his own, after a century of misunderstanding by his critics. We can join Professor Torrey heartily in wishing that this book will help to make audible again, even in the ranks of scholars, the voice that has been crying in the wilderness for so long the message of the eternity of the Word of our God.

PAUL F. BARACKMAN.

THE MAKING OF LUKE-ACTS ⁴

HERE is a book altogether different in purpose from the usual study in the literature of the New Testament. As the author puts it, "This is not an introduction, an apology or a commentary" (p. v). And though he frankly asserts that it is least of all a work of edification, he writes with the conviction that a knowledge of the historical background and literary processes underlying a Biblical writing will do much to open up its moral and religious value. And that is the purpose of this book—to examine the literary processes which governed the writing of Luke-Acts, "to focus attention on the history of the books' origin" (p. vi).

Four major divisions comprise this work of nearly four hundred pages, printed in small type—eight-point, to be exact. The first part contains a survey of the materials used by the evangelist. Naturally this involves a discussion of the Synoptic problem which Dr. Cadbury handles with freshness of

⁴ The Making of Luke-Acts. By Henry J. Cadbury. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xii+385.

viewpoint and with due consideration of recent writings on this subject. Those familiar with the discussion with respect to "Q" will be interested in the author's redefinition of "Q," "not as the source from which Matthew and Luke derive in common what they do not derive from Mark, but as the source from which they derive *directly* what they do not derive from Mark" (p. 107).

The second section deals at length with the common methods of thought and expression at that period. Every writer is the creature of the habits and conventions of the age in which he does his work. The author's task in this section is to set forth the principles prescribed for Luke by the literary methods of his time. And here Dr. Cadbury gives evidence of his wide and thorough knowledge of the conventional processes of ancient historians, how they got and used their sources, their treatment of their predecessors, Josephus affording a typical illustration, their forms of expression, and so on.

This discussion is worth while for its informing value, entirely apart from its application to Luke. And when these principles are brought to bear in an analysis of Luke's writing the result is interesting and illuminating. An example is Luke's evident attempt to improve on the literary form of his sources, a common practice in his day. For instance, "It should be recalled that Greek required that every sentence should be connected by a conjunction and that it eschewed foreign words and disliked repetition" (p. 180). A comparison of Mark 12:35-44 and the same material in Luke 20:41-21:4 follows to show how Luke, in accordance with this principle, makes considerable improvement on his source by changing the conjunctions, eliminating certain words, and adding others. And the author adds that his "changes in diction never appear to be in the direction of less elegant Greek" (p. 180).

In his reporting of the speeches, letters, and canticles which occur in Luke's writings, Dr. Cadbury holds that the evangelist followed the custom of his age; that is, like Thucydides and other historians, "he more or less successfully composed speeches suited to the speakers and occasions out of his

imagination" (p. 190). The author is not dogmatic about this, but the opinion, that in the addresses the style is that of the evangelist, leads him to assume that the material is largely Lucan. And the letters in the Acts "are so characteristic of the author's style as to support the presumption that he is responsible for them" (p. 191).

He admits, however, that in transmitting the sayings of Jesus, Luke's procedure for the most part does not conform to this custom of the historians. "This material he takes over from earlier sources and presents to his readers with only slight change of wording" (p. 188). An exception to this is in Luke's record of Jesus' synagogue speech at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-27), which the author claims may be more largely attributed to the editor than to his sources.

Of course, Dr. Cadbury is not at all original in this. Schmiedel, Gardner, Baur, and others have long questioned the historical value of Luke's addresses, holding that he composed them *de novo* or with little regard to sources. Attention is drawn to this feature of the book, not only because it reveals the author's viewpoint, but because it involves a criticism of his attitude generally. He does not seem to give weight to those factors and considerations that distinguish Luke from certain of his contemporaries in the field of history. In the mind of this reviewer no little importance attaches to the vindication, by the researches of Ramsey and others, of Luke's excellent historical sense, which we may assume would restrain him from a careless handling of his materials. Furthermore the speeches in Acts may be tested by the canons of literary criticism, which is not done here.

But then it is the view of Dr. Cadbury with which we are concerned, not that of the reviewer. However, it is strange that the author does not credit Luke with the same faithfulness to his sources and the accuracy which he admitted the evangelist used in his account of the sayings of Jesus. Why should he change his method in the second part of his work? Dr. Cadbury's explanation is, that in the handling of the *Logia* Luke

follows the Semitic method. In the Acts, it seems, he has resumed the Greek mind. (See p. 188.)

The third part turns from the application of the ancient standards to Luke's writings to an analysis of the material itself for what it reveals of the personality of the historian. His point of view, which seems to be urban (see p. 245), his secular interests, as in the way people are entertained, to note a homely example, his social, religious, and theological attitudes—these are all in the sweep of the author's disclosures.

The last section considers the purpose of the historian, and the plan and scope of his work. Who the author is is left unstated, except that Dr. Cadbury does not think he was Luke the physician. It does not fall within his purpose to present a lengthy discussion of that question, but he registers his objection to the traditional view and leaves the matter with the dictum, "Honesty requires that we should not claim more than we know" (p. 360). With this judicious sentiment we should all agree, but this reviewer confesses that for him the traditional view is more satisfying than the author's objections are convincing.

The various possible motives of Luke in writing, unconscious and deliberate, are stated and discussed at length. The evidence of divine guidance in the whole movement, the presentation of the Christian message in such a way as to justify it in the mind of both Jew and Gentile, a defense of Roman law, and an apology for Paul—each has in it to a varying degree plausibility as a guiding and molding motive in writing. With regard to Luke's avowed purpose so far as his preface expresses it, Dr. Cadbury suggests that it is quite probable it is "to correct misinformation about Christianity rather than, as is so often supposed, to confirm the historical basis of Theophilus's religious faith" (p. 315).

The author warns against reading too much into Luke's preface to substantiate the theory that he claims for his work careful research, "*Erforschung*." And so he gives the following paraphrase of it as representing safe ground in interpreting it:

"WHEREAS many have ventured to recompose a narrative about the matters consummated among us, as those who had been at the start witnesses and helpers in the mission handed down to us, I also, gentle Theophilus, decided to write you *seriatim* since I had been now for a long time back in immediate touch with everything circumstantially, in order that you may gather the correctness as regards the accounts you have been given to understand" (p. 347).

Enough has been said to suggest not only the general plan and contents of this book but also the point of view and attitude of the author. It only remains to ask and answer the questions, What of it? Is it worth while?

It must be said that one will find this work full of negative criticism. He is impressed by the author's emphasis on Luke's limitations in method and in subject matter, by his omissions and abrupt conclusions, his want of research and verification, his reliance on conjecture and imagination, and his unscientific credulity and naïveté. Realizing this, Dr. Cadbury assures us that "these are mentioned, however, with no desire to find fault with his [Luke's] accomplishment but rather to defend him from unfair criticism" (p. 349). Fairness to Luke, he says, demands that he be not estimated by our modern standards for history or literature, but that he be judged by the standards of the day in which he wrote. The purpose of this book, therefore, is to recover for the modern reader those ancient standards, measured by which the author will concede that Luke attained a fair measure of success.

Yet with all its negations there is much of value in this study on Luke's writings. For one thing it is full of informing material both in the field of modern New Testament criticism and in the methods and ideals of ancient writers. Much of it is familiar material, to be sure, but nevertheless freshly put. With many of the author's conclusions with respect to Luke one will probably disagree, yet not without re-examining the foundation on which one's views may be resting.

One is glad also for this fresh emphasis on the importance in the New Testament of these two writings, comprising to-

gether a fourth of the entire New Testament, more in bulk than the total writings of either Paul or John.

And finally, for this reader at least, the perusal of this book has the merit of giving one a sense of the inadequacy of the literary method to account for Luke-Acts. Something more is needed to explain these books—something in the experience of the man as he was related to the development of that primitive church, heroic and empowered, that taken together with the factors here described may indeed make these writings not only more reliable history than Dr. Cadbury is ready to admit but the Word of God with life and power. Perhaps it is the touch of inspiration!

PAUL C. WARREN.

DIVORCE AND THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF NULLITY ⁵

THIS little volume of ninety-four pages consists of a series of four sermons preached by the author in Westminster Abbey in July, 1927. A Preface, valuable notes, and a good usable Index, are included. Dr. Charles had already issued, in 1921, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*.

In the Preface the author says, "But the present work by no means replaces the first, which provides a fulness of evidence inadmissible in this work" (p. v). He does, however, in the notes quote extensively from his earlier studies matter which is very luminous, and yet not material which could be used homiletically.

The subjects treated are: The New Testament Doctrine of Divorce and the Roman Dogma of Nullity; The New Testament Doctrine of Divorce; Marriage according to the Reformed Churches; Marriage according to the Roman Church: Its Peculiar Dogma of Nullity. A very helpful summary is given at the head of each division of each chapter, and it is quite possible to glean the contents of the entire book in a very few minutes. The matter is, however, thoroughly and thoughtfully handled. To those who know Dr. Charles in connection

⁵ Divorce and the Roman Doctrine of Nullity. By R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1927. Pp. 100. Index.

with his scholarly work on apocalyptic literature, it is a great surprise to find him handling with clear insight such an intensely practical question as that of marriage and divorce.

The motive back of the preaching of these sermons is found in the first paragraph:

"A recent controversy on the nullity of certain marriages as propounded by the Roman Church made me examine afresh the conclusions at which I had arrived, and as a result of that fresh study I feel it my duty to deal anew with the questions at issue from the standpoint of our Lord's teaching."

One of these marriages was one of the most famous of the many marriages of American girls into the English nobility. Because of the fortune involved, the publicity given to the nuptials, and the tragedy of its termination after many years and the birth of children, it has had a great interest for Americans as well as for the English. The entire action of the Roman Rota was so patently a case of ecclesiastical casuistry that it was an insult to the intelligence of the modern mind.

"Another dignitary of the Roman Church in England, writing in *The Times*, makes this statement: 'We are always dealing with marriages which are null for one or other of these reasons.' This authority enumerates fifteen and says there are more. Is it strange that unsophisticated and sound minds conclude that the Roman theory of marriage throws a doubt on the validity of every marriage and on the legitimacy of every child.

"The validity of a marriage depends, according to the Roman Church, on free consent at the actual moment of the marriage, though we must not forget the numberless impediments to which we have already referred, and which render marriage null and void." (P. 91 f.)

But the case in hand was "declared null and void on the ground of coercion."

"Probably few marriages have had such publicity, and the bride, stated to be terrified by her mother, must have had the chance of appeal to hundreds of her friends to help her. But she appealed to none, took her title and bore the Duke two sons before she found out, like the petitioner for annulment in

David Copperfield's case, who married in his wrong name, "in case he was not as comfortable as he hoped to be," that she was not as comfortable as in fact she hoped to be, and then she procured a divorce in the English Court.'" (P. 81, note.)

While the motive prompting these sermons is primarily this action of the Roman Rota and the dogma of nullity in the Roman Catholic Church, this comes last in the treatment of the subject. The primary thesis upon which Dr. Charles works is, that marriage is dissoluble, and his second proposition is, that the guiltless party has the right to contract a fresh marriage with the benediction of the church. Like a true Protestant Dr. Charles goes direct to the teaching of our Lord. Here, however, there is a difficulty which has to be solved concerning Matthew 19:3-9 and Mark 10:2-12. So he sets himself to the task of proving that the conflicting views of the Reformed and Eastern Churches and of the Roman Church, on marriage, are to be traced respectively to these narratives, which record our Lord's controversy with the Pharisees on the subject. He claims that obviously these are narratives of one and the same controversy, and that, as they "are irreconcilably at variance with each other, it follows that they cannot both be true" (p. 6).

This leads immediately to the application of the methods of the higher criticism for the purpose of arriving at the conclusion:

"Matt. xix.3 gives the authentic form of the question (§ 4), *i. e.* 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?', and xix.9 must be interpreted in connection with it. That this is the true interpretation of xix.9 is proved by Matt. v. 32, which obviously relates to the same controversy and which admits of only one interpretation—that the wife has been divorced on lesser grounds than unchastity. . . .

"Again, though Luke xvi.18, when standing alone and severed from its context, could be taken as declaring the indissolubility of marriage, yet since its original context has been preserved . . . by both Matthew and Mark (in the latter in an unhistoric form), it follows that Luke xvi.18 should be interpreted in accordance with this context as referring to a woman divorced on inadequate grounds." (P. 32.)

Dr. Charles treats Mark's report of the divorce controversy with scant courtesy and much indignation. He holds this narrative responsible for fixing the idea of indissolubility in the church's doctrine of marriage. Here are some of the terms in which the learned archdeacon refers to this part of the second Gospel.

"This form of the question is, I repeat, unhistorical and false; for no sane or self-respecting Pharisee could have put to our Lord a question so entirely at variance with the Mosaic law, a law which every true Jew regarded as the authoritative utterance of God Himself" (p. 10).

This is strong language confidently uttered on the ground of critical study. A further statement is:

"But it is not only the opening clause of Mark's narrative that is unhistorical. It is unhistorical in other respects. First, it contains another gross misstatement of fact; secondly, it assigns to the Pharisees words which were uttered by Christ, and assigns to Christ words which were used by the Pharisees.

"Let us take the misrepresentation of fact first. In the closing words of this narrative, Mark ascribes the following words to our Lord: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her: and if she herself shall put away (*ἀπολύσασα*) her husband and marry another, she committeth adultery' (Mark x. 12). This statement would have been incomprehensible to a Jew in the time of our Lord; for no Jewish woman had ever been allowed by the law of Moses to divorce (*ἀπολύειν*) her husband, and over one thousand years had to elapse after this interview between our Lord and the Pharisees, before under Jewish law the husband's right to divorce his wife at will was abolished." (P. 17 f.)

But worst of all is this:

"Yet Mark represents them as tamely replying in an apparently chastened mood, 'Moses suffered us to write a bill of divorcement and to put her away.' Whereupon our Lord quotes Gen. ii. 24, and in doing so omits a clause most pertinent to His argument. Here the quotation from Genesis, which in Matthew is put first and raises the whole controversy from the standpoint of a mere casuistical debate to a discussion on a high spiritual level, is relegated to the close. Thus the entire narrative in Mark is false in its statements of fact and hope-

lessly feeble in its style. With this untrustworthy record let us contrast the historical narrative in Matthew." (P. 24 f.)

The conclusion of the matter is:

"From whatever standpoint we have compared the narratives in Matthew and Mark, the trustworthiness of the Matthew narrative manifests itself as unassailable, alike from the standpoint of the other books of the N. T. and from all the known contemporary history of the time. The words 'except for unchastity' are indeed a gloss, but a gloss the aim of which is to enforce the original teaching of Christ. The narrative in Mark, on the other hand, is in part defective, in part injuriously interpolated, while, in what remains, the words of Christ are in one case attributed to the Pharisees, and those of the Pharisees to Christ, and the order of the replies altered to the complete detriment of the original narrative. All these recastings of the text can hardly have been accidental; for they alter radically the words of Christ and make them teach what they were never designed to teach, namely, that marriage is indissoluble." (P. 45 f.)

All of this is accounted for by the supposition that Peter or Mark or some interpolator endeavored to adapt the teachings of Jesus to conditions existing in Rome.

If there is a flaw in Archdeacon Charles' excellent scholarship there is also a flaw in his logic. But scholarship and logic do not necessarily go together. In particular notice the argument about a woman divorcing her husband.

"However deeply wronged, all that she could do was to prevail upon her husband 'to put' 'her away,' *i. e.*, to give her a *get*—a bill of divorce" (p. 18, note).

This is a clear statement of the law and of fact. And if the law were always observed the argument would be cogent. But in the face of this statement he mentions that Salome and Herodias acted in contravention to the law of Moses and the entire usages of the Jews in divorcing and deserting their respective husbands. If such things were done in the palace, does any one suppose that they were confined to the palace? One might assume that the law would be final, but all experiences teaches that it is not.

In addition to that, the teaching of Jesus was intended to extend beyond the bounds of Jewry. His teaching is catholic and universal as well as for all times. Jesus' teaching concerning marriage is a part of His ethical teaching. If we are concerned to know whether or not Jesus taught that marriage is indissoluble, we can arrive at a true conclusion by a better way than that offered by higher criticism. A human being does what he does because of what he is. The moral quality of an act depends upon the moral character of the person who does the deed. Christ traces behavior to its source and thus determines its quality. There need be no overt act, and still so long as adultery in intention exists in the heart, in the eyes of the Judge of all the earth that evil is a reality. Consider the saying, "every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:28). If that saying is true the position taken by Dr. Charles is very much complicated. His position is:

"'Just as the essential relation in every true marriage originates in the faithful troth of man and maid either to other, while the relation next in importance consists in the Church's recognising and blessing this mutual consecration of each to the other . . . so unfaithfulness on the part of either breaks the essential relation *though not the official or legal relation established by the Church or State* until the divorce is carried out'" (p. 2, note).

Does this assumption hold for an adulterous look or adultery in the heart, or is unfaithfulness only in the actual fact? The theory Archdeacon Charles proposes does not appear to be sufficient. His contention for dissolubility is not satisfactory. On the other hand, as is always true in the teachings of Jesus, suppose that for marriage as for all of life He sets the standard at perfection. With that standard there is no place for dissolubility. The ideal Christian marriage is not dissoluble, it is not even thought of as dissoluble. It is entered wholeheartedly and without reservation. To allow or admit the possibility of dissolution is an offense to the holy

love which urges the union and cements the bond. The tolerance of the thought of dissolution is in itself disloyalty.

The difficulty arises, however, from the blessing of the church upon marriages which are not Christian. If the church is willing to extend the blessing of marriage to those who do not accept the teaching of Jesus then a provision has to be made for marriages which are not perfect and for them there is of necessity the possibility of dissolubility.

This difficulty was recognized and provided for in the early church. "It is fitting for men and women who marry to form this union with the approval of the bishop, that their union may be according to the will of God, and not according to the dictation of concupiscence" (St. Ignatius of Antioch—*Epistola ad Polycarpum*, cap. 5, quoted by F. E. Warren in *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*). But in these days marriages of concupiscence are blessed and because such marriages are dissoluble an effort is made to lower the standard of indissolubility.

Our own view is that the narrative in Mark is a true record of the teaching of Jesus, and that Jesus did announce that marriage is indissoluble, but that this is an ideal of life to which only a part of the human race attain. In agreement with this teaching the Apostle Paul said: "The twain shall become one flesh." and "He that loveth his own wife loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own flesh." But this does not mean that marriage is indissoluble where there is no spiritual union. It does not mean that all whose marriage has been blessed by the church should be held in union when there is in fact a separation, and it does not mean that those who have been mismated by mistaken desire should not be married again. A great deal of intelligent and sympathetic thought needs to be given to this whole question, but it is not necessary to drag down the standards of Christianity to do so.

Archdeacon Charles holds that "the action of Rome in relation to marriage is in certain respects often irrational and lawless." With that I most heartily agree, but not on the same grounds. It is interesting to know that the grounds for

declaring nullity are: 1. Consanguinity, or blood relationship, even of a remote character; 2. spiritual affinities such as are constituted by two persons being god-parents to the same child; 3. a married Jew or a Jewess becoming a Christian, the marriage becomes invalid; 4. a marriage of coercion. These grounds all have no doubt come to be recognized for sufficient reason. On the other hand, they do little in the way of meeting the modern problem of mistaken and unhappy marriage.

In the present perplexed condition of the world in regard to the divorce problem it is easy to see that there should be some more authoritative method of approach to that problem on the part of the leaders of the church. Where marriages are nullified the church which has authority to bless the marriage, as well as the courts, should take cognizance of the dissolution.

The author is sensitive to the urgency of the problems he discusses. It is tremendously important, and much clean thinking is needed on the great and ancient institution of marriage.

JAMES PALMER.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

INDEX TO VOL. XIII, 1928

	PAGE
Albright, R. W. Understanding the Apostles' Creed.—Donald McFayden. (Book review.)	312
Barackman, Paul F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.— George Foot Moore. (Book review.)	296
Second Isaiah, The.—Charles Cutler Torrey. (Book review.)	618
Beginning of the Christian Era, The Religion of the Caesars at the. Eli E. Burriss	74
Bible, The Roman Catholic Church and the. G. Luverno Bickerstaph	370
Bickerstaph, G. Luverno. The Roman Catholic Church and The Bible	370
Books. (Books reviewed, under The Review.)	127, 296, 450, 605
Brewer, George. The Sure Foundation	405
Bunyan, Pastor and Preacher, John. C. Bernard Cockett	491
Burriss, Eli E. The Religion of the Caesars at the Beginning of the Christian Era	74
Caesars at the Beginning of the Christian Era, The Religion of the. Eli E. Burriss	74
Catholic Church and the Bible, The Roman. G. Luverno Bickerstaph	370
Chown, S. D. The Springs of Evangelistic Power	232
Christ at the Round Table.—E. Stanley Jones. (Book review.) Thomas F. Cummings	464
Christian Era, The Religion of the Caesars at the Beginning of the. Eli E. Burriss	74
Christianity in Edessa, The Founding of. Charles D. Matthews	85
Christianity of Pascal, The. John McNicol	172
Christianity, Past and Present.—Charles Guignebert. (Book review.) James Coffin Stout	605
Christians, Nero and the Primitive. E. G. Sihler	244
Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own Death. A. McCaig	196
Cockett, C. Bernard. John Bunyan, Pastor and Preacher	491
Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, A. (The Inter- national Critical Commentary.)—James A. Montgomery. (Book review.) George Stibitz	147
Cummings, Thomas F. Christ at the Round Table.—E. Stanley Jones. (Book review.)	464
Current Thought and Activity. (Under The Review.) Robert M. Kurtz	99, 267, 415, 569
Death, Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own. A. McCaig	196
Denmark, The Inner Mission Movement in. Stinus S. Loft	331
Divorce and the Roman Doctrine of Nullity.—R. H. Charles. (Book review.) James Palmer	629
Doctrine of the Kenosis in Philippians 2:5-8, The. Alva J. McClain	506
Doctrine of the Spirit, Paul's. R. Birch Hoyle	45
Du Bose, H. M. Shechem and the Historicity of Jacob	528
Edessa, The Founding of Christianity in. Charles D. Matthews	85
Editorial. Robert M. Kurtz	5, 165, 325, 485
Elephantine, The Long Hidden Treasures of. Parke P. Flournoy	553
Evangelistic Power, The Springs of. S. D. Chown	232
Experience, The Nature of Religious. Albert Clarke Wyckoff	12

	PAGE
Five "Musts" of the Christian Life.—F. B. Meyer. (Book review.) James Palmer	477
Flournoy, Parke P. The Long Hidden Treasures of Elephantiné.....	553
Foundation, The Sure. George Brewer.....	405
Founding of Christianity in Edessa, The. Charles D. Matthews.....	85
Frontispiece:	
R. Birch Hoyle.....	4
Edgar Young Mullins, John McNicol.....	164
E. M. Martinson.....	324
C. Bernard Cockett.....	484
Getting Acquainted with the New Testament.—Frank Eakin. (Book review.) Paul C. Warren.....	127
Harper's Lament, The. William Wallace Martin.....	549
Hoyle, R. Birch. Paul's Doctrine of the Spirit.....	45
Spirit in the Writings and Experience of Philo.....	351
Humanizing Our Philosophy. Edgar Young Mullins.....	216
Ignatius Loyola.—Paul van Dyke. (Book review.) James Coffin Stout....	142
Inner Mission Movement in Denmark, The. Stinus S. Loft.....	331
Israel and Babylon.—Lansdell Wardle. (Book review.) Agide Pirazzini....	470
Jacob, Shechem and the Historicity of. H. M. Du Bose.....	528
John Bunyan, Pastor and Preacher. C. Bernard Cockett.....	491
Joy, The Mission of. E. M. Martinson.....	392
Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.—George Foot Moore. (Book review.) Paul F. Barackman.....	296
Kenosis in Philipplians 2:5-8, The Doctrine of the. Alva J. McClain.....	506
Kuist, Howard Tillman. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament.—H. E. Dana, Julius R. Mantey. (Book review.).....	459
Kurtz, Robert M. Editorial.....5, 165, 325,	485
Current Thought and Activity. (Under The Review.).....99, 267, 415,	569
Our Jewish Neighbors.—John Stuart Conning. (Book review.).....	316
Lament, The Harper's. William Wallace Martin.....	549
Lausanne Conference, The. P. Whitwell Wilson.....	31
Life of Prayer in a World of Science, The.—William Adams Brown. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff.....	133
Light from the North: The Danish Folk Highschools: Their Meaning for America.—Joseph K. Hart. (Book review.) James Palmer.....	155
Loft, Stinus S. The Inner Mission Movement in Denmark.....	331
Long Hidden Treasures of Elephantiné, The. Parke P. Flournoy.....	553
Magoun, Herbert W. More than Atonement.—John B. Champion. (Book review.)	137
Making of Luke-Acts, The.—Henry J. Cadbury. (Book review.) Paul C. Warren	624
Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament, A.—H. E. Dana, Julius R. Mantey. (Book review.) Howard Tillman Kuist.....	459
Martha and Mary, or Temperament in Religion. A. T. Robertson.....	63
Martin, William Wallace. The Harper's Lament.....	549
Martinson, E. M. The Mission of Joy.....	392
Mary, or Temperament in Religion, Martha and. A. T. Robertson.....	63
Matthews, Charles D. The Founding of Christianity in Edessa.....	85
McCaig, A. Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own Death.....	196
McClain, Alva J. The Doctrine of the Kenosis in Philipplians 2:5-8.....	506
McNicol, John. The Christianity of Pascal.....	172
Mission of Joy, The. E. M. Martinson.....	392

	PAGE
Mission Movement in Denmark, The Inner. Stinus S. Loft.....	331
More than Atonement.—John B. Champion. (Book review.) Herbert W. Magoun	137
Mullins, Edgar Young. Humanizing Our Philosophy.....	216
Nature of Religious Experience, The. Albert Clarke Wyckoff.....	12
Nero and the Primitive Christians. E. G. Sihler.....	244
New Studies in Mystical Religion.—Rufus Jones. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff	303
Our Jewish Neighbors.—John Stuart Conning. (Book review.) Robert M. Kurtz	316
Palmer, James. Seeking the Mind of Christ.—Robert E. Speer. (Book review.)	152
Light from the North: The Danish Folk Highschools: Their Meaning for America.—Joseph K. Hart. (Book review.).....	155
Five "Musts" of the Christian Life.—F. B. Meyer. (Book review.)....	477
Divorce and the Roman Doctrine of Nullity.—R. H. Charles. (Book review.)	629
Pascal, The Christianity of. John McNicol.....	172
Paul's Doctrine of the Spirit. R. Birch Hoyle.....	45
Philippians 2:5-8, The Doctrine of the Kenosis in. Alva J. McClain.....	506
Philo, Spirit in the Writings and Experience of. R. Birch Hoyle.....	351
Philosophy, Humanizing Our. Edgar Young Mullins.....	216
Pirazzini, Agide. Israel and Babylon.—Lansdell Wardle. (Book review.)..	470
Power, The Springs of Evangelistic. S. D. Chown.....	232
Primitive Christians, Nero and the. E. G. Sihler.....	244
Religion, Martha and Mary, or Temperament in. A. T. Robertson.....	63
Religion of the Caesars at the Beginning of the Christian Era, The. Eli E. Burriess	74
Religious Experience, The Nature of. Albert Clarke Wyckoff.....	12
Review, The: Current Thought and Activity. Books.....99, 267, 415,	569
Robertson, A. T. Martha and Mary, or Temperament in Religion.....	63
Roman Catholic Church and the Bible, The. G. Luverno Bickerstaph.....	370
Second Isaiah, The.—Charles Cutler Torrey. (Book review.) Paul F. Barackman	618
Seeking the Mind of Christ.—Robert E. Speer. (Book review.) James Palmer.	152
Shechem and the Historicity of Jacob. H. M. Du Bose.....	528
Sihler, E. G. Nero and the Primitive Christians.....	244
Spirit in the Writings and Experience of Philo. R. Birch Hoyle.....	351
Spirit, Paul's Doctrine of the. R. Birch Hoyle.....	45
Springs of Evangelistic Power, The. S. D. Chown.....	232
Stibitz, George. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. (The International Critical Commentary.)—James A. Montgomery. (Book review.).....	147
Stout, James Coffin. Ignatius Loyola.—Paul van Dyke. (Book review.)....	142
Christianity, Past and Present.—Charles Guignebert. (Book review.)..	605
Sure Foundation, The. George Brewer.....	405
Sweet, Louis Matthews. Volts from a Layman's Dynamo. Vol. II. Messiah or Bastard: Which?—Herbert W. Magoun. (Book review.).....	307
The Unique Status of Man.—Herbert Wildon Carr. (Book review.)....	450
Temperament in Religion, Martha and Mary, or. A. T. Robertson.....	63
Transition.—Will Durant. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff.....	454
Treasures of Elephantine, The Long Hidden. Parke P. Flournoy.....	553
Understanding the Apostles' Creed.—Donald McFayden. (Book review.)	
R. W. Albright.....	312

	PAGE
Unique Status of Man, The.—Herbert Wildon Carr. (Book review.) Louis Matthews Sweet	450
Volts from a Layman's Dynamo. Vol. II. Messiah or Bastard: Which?—Herbert W. Magoun. (Book review.) Louis Matthews Sweet.....	307
Warren, Paul C. Getting Acquainted with the New Testament.—Frank Eakin. (Book review.)	127
The Making of Luke-Acts.—Henry J. Cadbury. (Book review.).....	624
Wilson, P. Whitwell. The Lausanne Conference.....	31
Wrestle of Religion with Truth, The.—Henry Nelson Wieman. (Book review.) Albert Clarke Wyckoff.....	609
Wyckoff, Albert Clarke. The Nature of Religious Experience.....	12
The Life of Prayer in a World of Science.—William Adams Brown. (Book review.)	133
New Studies in Mystical Religion.—Rufus Jones. (Book review.).....	303
Transition.—Will Durant. (Book review.).....	451
The Wrestle of Religion with Truth.—Henry Nelson Wiemann. (Book review.)	609